FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 174 9 September 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gorbachev Answers RUDE PRAVO on Moratorium AA 1
Ligachev Hands Over Replies AA 1
Gorbachev Replies [IZVESTIYA 9 Sep] AA 1
Moratorium, U.S. Tests Discussed on 'Top Priority' AA 11
[Bogdanov, Plekhanov, Pozner]
U.S. Scientist Cited on Verifying Moratorium AA 16
CDE Delegates Return Home for 'Consultations' [Helsinki] AA 16

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Question and Answers' CC 1
[Kasparov, Shishlin, Lavrentyev, Peresada, Fonarev]
APN 'Round Table' Discusses Global Problems CC 5
[Martynov, Falin, Gromyko, Gerasimov, Bestuzhev-Lada, Hickel, Kuehn]
Correspondent Views U.S. Ties With NATO Allies [Borin, Sedov] CC 11
International Sea Safety Meeting Opens in London CC 12

UNITED STATES & CANADA

IZVESTIYA: More Details on Daniloff Charge [Krotov, 9 Sep] A 1
Daniloff Arrest Linked to Anti-Soviet Hysteria [Kasparov] A 3
Armacost Threatens 'Diplomatic Retribution' [Druzhinin] A 4
'Rejoinder' Hits Speakes Remarks on Leaks A 4
[PRAVDA 5 Sep]
U.S. Policy Termed 'Economic Blackmail' [Vavilov] A 5

CHINA

Talyzin Discusses Bilateral Ties in Reception Speech B 1
PRC Trade Group Ends Kazakhstan Talks 19 Aug B 2
[SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN 21 Aug]

NORTHEAST ASIA

U.S. Pacific Maneuvers Seen as 'Provocative' C 1
[Latyshev in PRAVDA 4 Sep]
Commentary Notes Japan's Protest Against RSA Ties [Rogov] C 1
Japanese General Meets With U.S. Admiral Hayes C 2
Briefs: Joint Japanese Convention Held C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Najibullah Speaks on Planned Troop Withdrawal D 1
Benazir Bhutto, Opposition Leaders Released D 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Gerasimov Counters FRG's Woerner on Moratorium G 1
Murakhovskiy, FRG Minister Discuss Environment G 3
'Frank Exchange' Held With Bundestag Delegation G 4
Delegation Ends Visit G 4
Vorontsev in Paris on M. East, Daniloff, Arms G 4
[Paris LE MONDE 6 Sep]
Further on Swiss Foreign Minister's Visit G 6
More on Shevardnadze Talks G 6
Shevardnadze Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 7 Sep] G 7
Report on Aubert Dinner Speech G 9
Demichev Meets With Finnish President Koivisto G 10
Delegation Returns G 10
Gorbachev Writes Preface to Works in Swedish G 11

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Article Views U.S. 'Displeasure' With Libya H 1
[Musayelyan in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Sep]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Ethiopian Party Delegation Visits Moscow 1-8 Sep J 1
Fedorov Commentary Lauds Sowetan Resistance J 1

LATIN AMERICA

Nicaragua's Borge Urges Heightened Vigilance K 1
[Kurguzov]
Moscow Reports Assassination Attempt on Pinochet K 1
Soviet Seamen Injured in Explosion in Peru K 1
[IZVESTIYA 3 Sep]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Dolgikh Attends Meeting for Oil, Gas Workers R 1
Cultural Foundation Meeting Reported R 1
[PRAVDA 30 Aug]
Further Coverage on Aftermath of Liner Accident R 2
Leadership Condolences [PRAVDA 6 Sep] R 2
Report on Relief Work [Obraztov] R 2
Geophysicist on Aerial Survey of Chernobyl Area R 3
[Alimov in IZVESTIYA 3 Sep]
Briefs: Order of October R 4

GORBACHEV ANSWERS RUDE PRAVO ON MORATORIUM

Ligachev Hands Over Replies

LD081439 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS -- Yegor Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today Zdenek Horeni, member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, chief editor of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO who arrived in Moscow.

On instructions of Mikhail Gorbachev, he handed in to him the answers of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to the questions of the Editorial Board sent to him beforehand.

Gorbachev Reply

PM081715 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 1, 2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Answers to Questions From RUDE PRAVO Chief Editor Comrade Zdenek Horeni" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Question: Your statement on the extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 evoked a very broad response and, it seems to us in Czechoslovakia, it has had a serious impact on the arrangement of sociopolitical forces in the world regarding questions of disarmament.

How do you assess the reasons for this and the possible consequences of the Soviet Union's major new peace-loving action?

Answer: The answer to the first part of the question seems obvious. Considerably more people have now learned about the Soviet moratorium than some time ago. The political leaders and mass information media of the West are finding it increasingly difficult to hush up the fact of the unilateral 1 1/2 year moratorium, and indeed, the U.S. arguments in favor of testing have become tarnished and their effect on the public has waned somewhat. That is my first observation. Secondly, an increasingly profound realization of the reality of the nuclear threat is spreading throughout the world.. This threat can be averted only by eliminating nuclear weapons, as we are proposing, and -- as a first step -- by ending nuclear testing. This is as clear as daylight, as the saying goes. Even people obsessed with the arms race cannot fail to realize this, in their heart of hearts.

Our socialist friends, communist parties, the conference of the Nonaligned Movement in Harare which represents dozens of states, the leaders of the "Delhi Six," numerous public organizations and trade unions, authoritative political parties, including the West German Social Democrats, and the British Laborites, and prominent figures of science and culture throughout the workd have come out in support of the Soviet moratorium and have appealed to America to follow the USSR's example. On the whole it can be said that it is easier to enumerate those who have not supported our action than those who have approved it.

Words of support -- and we value them highly -- confirm that the new political thinking is forcing a way for itself through ingrained prejudices, outmoded notions, and through the obstructions of falsehood about the "Soviet threat."

So far as can be judged from American data, U.S. public opinion and a considerable proportion of the Congress support the idea of ending nuclear tests.

In a word, it has never before been so generally accepted that nuclear war cannot be waged and that there cannot be a victor in such a war whatever artful scenarios for hostilities may be devised.

Something else can be added to this: U.S. policy is beginning to scare people more and more; glaring manifestations of a militarist line have opened many people's eyes and no longer can anyone conceal alarm over the fact that a catastrophe really could occur.

The response generated by the Soviet Union's ending of nuclear explosions is also linked, of course, with the fact that this is not a declaration but action. For the fourth time we have extended the moratorium. A year without explosions is both a political and military reality. The trend of wisdom and common sense is now present in practice in world politics and can be developed and consolidated with an agreement on mutual prohibition of nuclear tests. And also by other bold, strong steps, and by the solution of pressing issues and issues that are overdue for solution.

Surely, for instance, it is important for the destiny of Europe and of the whole world to crown the work of the Stockholm conference with a sound accord? Undoubtedly it is. And for its part, the Soviet Union together with Czechoslovakia and the other socialist countries is taking practical steps to have that come about. There is a possibility -- I have already had occasion to speak about this -- to reach a consensus on banning chemical weapons and eliminating their industrial base.

Rational compromises are possible on strategic arms, medium-range nuclear missile weapons, and conventional arms if one in fact strives for a lowering of the level of military confrontation and for equivalent [ravnoznachnyy] security. An accord is also possible on strengthening the regime of such a fundamental document as the ABM treaty.

But things must be looked at as they actually are. The opportunities would seem to be multiplying but there is no change for the better.

In this sense the reaction in the U.S. ruling circles to our statement is indicative. From the very outset the reaction has revealed that at least in the entourage of the President, whose spokesman this time did not even attempt to conceal his annoyance, there is, for the moment, no serious thought being given to the elimination of the nuclear threat. This is why the extension of the moratorium generated such dissatisfaction there. One can see that people in those cirlces felt uncomfortable when faced with the new Soviet proposals. It has evidently become very difficult to justify one's stance in the eyes of both the world public and the U.S. public.

But once again they have set off along the same old road, seeking to belittle the significance of our action by labeling it "propaganda." [paragraph continues]

But the question arises: If this is propaganda what do we want to prove to people and what do we want to say with it? To convince them that it is possible to do without nuclear explosions? To say that we are backing up our appeal for mankind to be rid of nuclear weapons by ending the testing of them? What's wrong with such "propaganda"?

In general, regarding our being accused of "propaganda," I have already said repeatedly: It is not serious of people to want to transfer our responsible political actions to such a plane. This is the wrong approach to take at such a tense, one could say, turning point of world development.

We do not want to win in a propaganda war. We do not even want to participate in such a "skirmish," considering it unworthy of the importance of the topic [schutaya yeye nedostoynoy vazhnosti predmeta]. Our aim is to take a real step toward real disarmament. And we sincerely invite the U.S. Administration to do this. We want to get the negotiations moving in order to drive away the nuclear threat for the sake of the security of everyone and for the sake of genuine detente [razraydka].

There is certainly a great deal of propaganda speculation surrounding our moratorium in the entourage of the White House, in political circles, and also in the press. The impression is sometimes formed that in the United States there is a general inclination to replace foreign policy with propaganda. How can we get a businesslike dialogue then, one that promises success! We reject such a style and we believe that we are talking about things that are too serious for verbal games to be played around them. And we want to count on the fact that ultimately we will be understood in America and that our appeal will receive an adequate and fitting response.

Speaking of the "seriousness" that we have been urged to show regarding our latest extension of the moratorium, I should like to say that today the attitude toward ending nuclear tests and to the speediest drawing up of a treaty on their total prohibition has become a most cogent indicator of how seriously each of the biggest nuclear powers does in fact regard disarmament, international security, and indeed the cause of peace in general.

In the 18 August statement, I have already said that one's attitude to nuclear explosions is a test of historical maturity. I am deeply convinced of this.

Moreover, this is a touchstone for verifying real purposefulness and for verifying the main content of a nuclear state's foreign policy.

Indeed.

If you want military superiority you don't need a moratorium.

If you want to continue the arms race, and particularly if you want to shift it into new spheres, into space, you don't need a moratorium.

If you want to have new and more sophisticated types of weapons a moratorium counts for nothing here.

If in solving international problems you count on force and intend to resort to diktat and blackmail a moratorium is also an impediment to you.

If you fear honest competition with the other social system in the field of the economy, democracy, culture, and the spiritual richness of human life, a moratorium is obviously not suitable for you.

If you are not concerned about what happens to nature or the human environment will continue to carry out nuclear explosions.

If the avaricious appetites of the bosses of the military business and all those connected with them are more important than the opinions and vital interests of hundreeds of millions of people throughout the world you continue nuclear tests.

In other words, the attitude taken toward a moratorium reveals the real essence and thrust of a policy. There is no getting away from this.

But if there is a real desire to start reducing and then to completely do away with nuclear weapons, as both the President himself and certain members of his administration have officially and solemnly stated repeatedly, if there is a real understanding that nuclear war is intolerable, if the trust is that the United States does not seek military superiority, there are no fundamental obstacles to reaching an equal and strictly verifiable [proveryayemyy] agreement.

This is why we consider that "the ball is not in the Russians' court," as the silver-tongued heralds of the White House assert, but in the Americans' court.

Incidentally, the question is even braoder and more significant than the attitude toward a moratorium, although, I repeat, the attempts to avoid this disarmament problem of fundamental important, lose [rastvorit] it in other questions, and switch it to another plane are quite characteristic.

For if you catalogue the administration's entire post-Geneva policy, an alarming picture takes shape. Here we find the expediting of SDI, tests of the ASAT antisatellite complex, and other actions undermining the ABM treaty; the tests of a new ICBM and new aircraft and submarines and statements about abandoning the SALT II treaty -- and at the very moment when it s being proposed that a second summit meeting be held with us; fantastic requests for the new militry budget; appropriations for binary weapons; strong-arm marauding "neoglobalist" actions against Libya and Nicaragua and in southern Africa and elsewhere; and military maneuvers in the vicinity of the Soviet Union -- from the North Sea and the Baltic to the Far East -- which have no parallel since the fifties in terms of resources mobilized. Marshal Akhromeyev was right when he said at the Stockholm conference: Imagine what would happen if the Warsaw Pact countries launched such maneuvers!"

How are we to interpret these challenging military demonstrations? As a manifestation of peaceableness and an aspiration for mutual understanding or, maybe, as preparing the atmosphere for a summit meeting?

Incidentally, in and around the White House it is being stated outright: All this is necessary to force the Russians into new concessions. Such is the level of responsibility of those for whom the arms race is a pot of gold and, incidentally, the level of their understanding of those with whom they are dealing.

This kind of military-political practice prompts a very serious conclusion: They want to legalize the arms race; essentially this is material and psychological preparation for a world war. The question that the public is rightfully beginning to ask is: What? Is America preparing [sobirayetsya] to fight? If so, the logic of the administration's actions is understandable.

Associations with the sixties, when an extreme reactionary grouping nakedly expressed its White House ambitions, involuntarily come to mind. But at that time America itself put that grouping under siege. Other people came to power, and an opportunity opened up for curbing the spread of "cold war" and then, in the seventies, halting it altogether. Treaties were concluded, and some of them are still operating today.

But what are we seeing now? Military programs are again being launched, but programs of a kind which create a much greater threat of the unleashing of world war than at that time since this is taking place at a new scientific and technical stage of the arms race and when much bigger arsenals of weapons capable of destroying civilization several times over are in existence.

Therefore the task for our two countries and all peace-loving forces is to prevent this arms race from becoming irreversible.

A much more serious responsibility than before -- a special responsibility, I would say -- for the direction which the course of world events will take lies with the American people. They have something to ponder.

I want to believe in the American people's sense, realism, and even elementary sense of self-preservation. Our two peoples need to cooperate, not be hostile; to be friendly, not fight. I again appeal for this.

I know, Comrade Horeni, that in your country, Czechoslovakia, in our country, and in other countries the following question is often asked: Does not a desire to undermine the USSR and the socialist community economically lie behind the policy of an uncurbed arms race? In particular, how is it possible to assess both the official statements and the conjectures in the mass media that the economic problems and difficulties existing in the USSR will force it, if a bit more pressure is exerted, to agree to one-sided consessions?

We do have economic problems and difficulties. We have been and continue to be open about them. There are a considerable number of problems and difficulties in other countries, particularly those which have recently embarked on the path of independent development. But surely such problems also exist in the West, in the United States itself? Moreover they are growing threateningly there, most acute problems are accumulating, the state debt has reached astronomical figures, and the enormous unemployment is again beginning to assume threatening dimensions, and social contradictions are deepening.

As for our economic concerns, we would like to cope with them more rapidly and better and therefore we would welcome any opportunity to switch resources and forces from defense into civilian sectors, into increasing people's prosperity. But we will never sacrifice security interests here and will not make concessions on security, including at talks. Indeed, the Soviet people would not allow us to do this.

We can see clearly the attempts to use the arms race to undermine the USSR and world socialism economically. And we will do everything to prevent these malicious plans from coming about. We will act in several areas at once: in the diplomatic, military, political and -- indeed yes! -- propaganda areas, but primarily in the economic area. We will increase the economy's efficiency, build up acceleration, and improve management.

From this viewpoint, high-quality labor by Soviet people and working people from the socialist community countries is simultaneously a contribution to the cause of peace. If we show any weakness, the pressure by the enemies of socialism grows. If we become stronger and more solid economically, politically, and socially, the capitalist world shows greater interest in normal relations with us, and any illusions that the course of history can be reversed are dispersed.

Question: Responses to your statement include some like this: It is said that neither a unilateral moratorium nor even a bilateral agreement with the United States on this issue would make any practical contribution to the solution of the nuclear disarmament problem. Is this so?

Answer: Under no circumstances can I agree with this.

Attempts are indeed being made to place the moratorium in opposition to arms reduction, and even to prove that it supposedly prevents the start of the disarmament process. The following opinion is current in certain circles and the press: It is said that nuclear weapons are an "evil," but a "necessary evil" since they serve deterrence, and if this is so, they need to have their reliability checked -- in other words, tests must be conducted.

All this is absurd, if not an attempt to confuse people.

Way back in January we proposed a joint start on "eradicating the evil itself" -- eliminating all nuclear weapons by the end of the century. Of course, this is not an easy task. But we also propose that it be solved stage by stage taking all complexities into account; we allow 15 years for this; we envisage parallel efforts in the sphere of the elimination of chemical weapons and radical reductions of conventional weapons; and, simultaneously with disarmament, we have in mind progress in the political, economic, and humanitarian spheres of international relations.

Attempts to set the question of ending nuclear explosions in opposition to the question of reducing nuclear weapons are in bad faith for one more reason. Such attempts sow the illusion that apparently the two powers had already "almost" agreed on radical reductions of nuclear weapons, and suddenly the USSR created an obstruction with its moratorium. But matters stand completely differently. Since the time of the Geneva meeting, and despite all the USSR's efforts, we have not moved an inch closer to an arms reduction agreement.

And yet, a mutual termination of nuclear explosions would immediately and substantially help an agreement on this. After all, termination of tests would essentially halt the race in the most dangerous sphere -- the sphere of the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of nuclear weapons and their improvement. The only thing left to tackle is the quantitative arms race, which is simpler.

Thus, our stance is that the termination of nuclear explosions is organically linked with the reduction of nuclear arms and would seriously help solve this task. I am no longer talking about the political aspect of the matter. You would agree that mistrust, fear, and suspicion have a fatal effect on the international climate. There is also the ethical and moral aspect. To continue tests means to expend resources and funds for evil, while there is an unbelievably great and still growing need for them for good humanitarian work.

Question: It is said that Soviet nuclear weapons are "simpler and do not need reliability checks," while the American ones are "more complex and therefore their efficiency must be continually tested."

Another story is circulating to the effect that, prior to announcing its moratorium in 1985, the Soviet Union had improved its nuclear arsenal, considerably overtook America in this respect, and therefore can allow itself a break in testing, while the United States, it is said, now has to "catch up" and that is why it is conducting explosions.

What is the truth?

Answer: There is no truth at all. All these claims are false from beginning to end.

Specialists prove extremely convincingly that nuclear explosions are in no way necessary to confirm the reliability of already existing nuclear weapons. Reliability can be verified [kontrolirovat] just as efficiently and, at the same time, far more cheaply and safely by other methods, without nuclear explosions.

Prolonged practical experience testifies that it is possible to feel sure about nuclear ammunition without conducting explosions and while confining oneself to checking [proverka] the nonnuclear components of bombs and warheads. In accordance with the existing treaty, the United States and the USSR have not conducted tests with a yield in excess of 150 kilotons since 1974. Meanwhile, ammunition with yields that exceed this "threshold" constitutes 70 percent of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, and ours is no less. This means that both we and they have faith in the reliability of weapons even without explosions! Why confuse the issue?

If the Americans doubt the durability [ustoychivost] of their nuclear arsenal, let them embark on the elaboration of an agreement to terminate tests and our specialists will share with them the "secrets" of how to check the condition of nuclear charges even without tests.

No. The main purpose of the nuclear weapon tests being conducted by the United States is the creation [sozdaniye] of fundamentally new types of weapons. What does this mean? Here is what it means: New nuclear warheads, with greater yield and increased accuracy, are being developed [razrabatyvatsya]. Space-based nuclear weapons -- X-ray lasers with so-called nuclear pumping -- are being created [sozdatsya] in the course of the tests. Work is being done to prepare [podgotovka] a completely new type of weapon capable of striking targets both on earth and in space. Under these circumstances it is hypocritical to say that a test ban would produce nothing to solve the problem of nuclear disarmament.

With regards to the second argument, it could have sounded somewhat like the truth during the first couple of months of our moratorium, but not now that the silence reigning on Soviet nuclear test sites is into its second consecutive year. If the development [razrabotka] of new nuclear weapons and the improvement of old ones demand more and more nuclear tests -- and this is undoubtedly the case -- then, according to logic, the United States, which has conducted many more explosions than the USSR, plus the 18 in the year of our moratorium, should be far ahead. It appears, therefore, that we rather than they should be catching up. To put it briefly, the actual way in which the issue is presented is absurd.

We have also heard the following opinion: It is not possible, as far as tests are concerned, to be satisfied for a certain period of time with a compromise between the Soviet and U.S. positions; in other words, not a complete ban, but some kind of "regulation" [reglamentatsiya] of tests.

Of course, when proposing an agreement to the other side, one must never reject compromises outright. But the idea of "regulation" instead of termination still seems to me incorrect in principle.

In the first place, we already have regulation: the 1963 treaty and the so-called "threshold" agreements of 1974 and 1976. But they have not halted the arms race. It has even been intensified -- of course, not because these treaties are in existence.

The very same thing could happen with the proposed "regulation" of underground nuclear tests. It is more than likely to result in the race taking another direction which would later appear to have been even more dangerous.

There can simply be no halfway solution to the problem of nuclear tests. There is only one honest way to present the question: Either agree not to test nuclear charges and put an end to this once and for all times, or signal the start of even more dangerous military preparations. There is no third option.

If the Americans were able to drag the world into a space arms race, whatever terms they might use to describe these arms -- "defensive" or otherwise -- it would certainly lead to an extremely risky destabilization of the entire military-strategic situation. The threat to mankind would take on qualitatively new lethal parameters. No one has the right to close his eyes to this.

Question: Once again, as with all the Soviet Union's other initiatives, President Reagan's entourage and representatives of certain other NATO governments are trying to distract attention from the cardinal problem you have raised -- that of the nuclear disarmament process -- using all kinds of speculations about monitoring [kontrol] and verification [proverka].

How do you evaluate this approach?

Answer: Precisely as you do -- as an attempt to distract attention. They want to prolong the life of the bankrupt argument to the effect that a nuclear test ban is impossible to verify [prokontrolirovat]. This argument has become bankrupt, primarily because of the successes of science. Today it is possible to detect any nuclear explosion, even the smallest, by national means. In order to help resolve the problem, the Soviet Union has nonetheless consented to other methods of verification [kontrol]. [paragraph continues]

The "Delhi Six" offered their services -- we agreed; but the United States was silent. Scientists reached agreement on installing seismographs and other equipment near the nuclear testing ranges in the USSR and the United States -- we supported this initiative too, despite the fact that the American Government was scornful of it.

Not so long ago I received a group of prominent scientists and specialists in this sphere from USSR, the United States, the West European countries, and Japan, and had a detailed conversation with them. I was once again convinced that they do not have the slightest doubt about the possibility of the most reliable verification [kontrol] of a nuclear test ban.

But at the moment, this is how things stand: The United States has not expressed any readiness to embark on disarmament and is talking not about verification [kontrol] of disarmament, but about verification [kontrol] of arms.

I myself and our military comrades have more than once had occasion to say: We know what the Americans are doing, what happens at their nuclear and other testing ranges. And their attempts to conceal some things, including some of their explosions (among them one carried out a week ago), convince us yet again that you cannot take them at their word. And indeed: We have no reason to trust the American generals, and we cannot count on trust on their part. We are therefore in favor of strict, scientifically substantiated verification [kontrol] and we will insist on it, including on-site inspection. But I repeat: not of the carrying out of explosions, but of the ending of explosions.

American instruments have already been installed near the Soviet nuclear testing range in Semipalatinsk Oblast. We believe that it would be possible to transform the scientists' accord into an official agreement and jointly keep an eye on things in order to ensure that a possible agreement on ending nuclear explosions is not violated. We could also think about creating an international, supranational network of verification [kontrol] of the ending of tests. I will take this opportunity to put this proposal to the U.S. President. The problem here is completely solvable. The fact that Washington is trying to portray it as a nut which cannot be cracked is simple to explain: The United States is not prepared to renounce the arms race, and so it is bluffing.

I repeat: they need nuclear explosions not for deterrence (there is nobody to deter; nobody is about to attack the United States) but for the creation of weapons designed for the waging of nuclear war.

Question: One last, delicate question, Comrade Gorbachev, if I may. Judging by numerous statements from the U.S. President's entourage, and indeed the Western press, they now want to focus the world public's attention on a new meeting between you and Mr Reagan and in effect to substitute talk about this for all the topical problems of curbing the arms race.

What can you say about that?

Answer: We are in favor of holding a Soviet-American summit meeting, a meeting which would be marked by perceptible progress in resolving at least one or two significant problems of international security.

After Geneva we took many steps to bring our positions closer together on a wide range of problems concerning overcoming the arms race. The approach which could be formulated as "all or nothing" is alien to us. But it is not worth having a meeting for the sake of "nothing." Perhaps that would suit some people; it certainly does not suit us.

The questions at issue concern all countries, the entire world community, although the measure of responsibility is, of course, particularly great for the Soviet Union and the United States. That is why, however much we are provoked, we do not break the threads of contacts with the American Administration, we do not call into question their usefulness, we do not slam the door (although some people in the West, and particularly in the U.S. President's entourage, would very much like that). But the value of contacts lies not in contacts themselves, but in their results.

We expect that the upcoming meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz will help to clarify where we stand at the moment, whether the Soviet-American dialogue has a chance of progress.

If they deliberately proceed from the premise that a moratorium is unacceptable, if the question of medium-range missiles in Europe is blocked, if strategic arms have to be improved, and so forth, then what is there to negotiate about? In the atmosphere of a frantic arms race, fueling of tension, and demolition of existing treaties, a summit meeting is hardly going to be of any use. But it would be quite easy to use it is deceive people, to reassure the public by creating a semblance of well-being and at the same time continue to dangerous policy. In fact, there are already attempts to do this by creating the impression that preparations for a meeting are in full swing.

And by fueling false optimism this way: Everything is virtually ready for the meeting they say -- they are reckoning, perhaps, on making sure that they shift the responsibility for the results of their destructive policy onto the Soviet Union. There is another idea that probably has the same purpose: the idea that the USSR has concluded that you will not get anywhere with the Reagan administration.

But we attach too much importance to the time factor to decide now to mark time for 2 and 1/2 years. No. To wait, to delay would be an inexcusable error. We will continue to use every opportunity for productive dialogue, for progress toward the limitation and reduction of armaments, and for the settlement of regional conflicts and the development of international cooperation in all urgent areas. In this sense we have a clear conscience as far as the Soviet people and other peoples are concerned. And our Czechoslovak friends and the socialist community countries understand us well and consistently and firmly support us.

I want to stress that we very much value and scrupulously take into account our allies' opinion and are fully resolved to further improve the mechanism and methods of consultations and the joint elaboration of socialism's foreign policy. We value highly our allies' and firends' political initiatives and their activeness in the struggle for a new way of political thinking and active and equal participation in common efforts to solve the problems of peace, security, and disarmament.

I do not think I can remain silent about another aspect of the matter connected with the summit prospects. There have been many fabrications about my confidential correspondence with the U.S. President. [paragraph continues]

I do not want to disclose its content, but I will say something about the fabrications. Their sin lies in the fact that they are deliberately optimistic and there is something of a publicity maneuver about them.

In late July we received another letter from the U.S. President -- a reply, as it were, to our initiatives. I know that in the West this letter is presented as something new in terms of Washington's stance, "leaks" have been been arranged for the administration's benefit, and they pretend that the ball is now in Moscow's court. We will, of course, give the President our reply.

I have thoroughly examined the President's letter, under a miscroscope and through a telescope, figuratively speaking. I will not be more specific -- after all, confidentiality was agreed. But I can appreciate people's desire to know what is in it -- in this private letter. After all, it affects them all, all the people in the world. If they could see the texts of both letters and compare the significance of each of them in terms of unraveling the main knots on the path of disarmament they would see how seriously and responsibly the Soviet leadership approaches the problem of preventing war, the way we formulate our proposals in a specific and businesslike manner, taking into account the other side's interests.

They would see, too, that we are by no means without hope, that we believe in the force of reason and mankind's sense of self-preservation.

By our actions and initiatives we are seeking to strengthen the peoples' hope that the situation can be changed, that there is an available alternative to confrontation. I believe we have already entered the second stage of the global antinuclear process, the phase not only of hopes but of realistic plans and specific actions based on them. As a Communist I believe in the strength of the masses who are in the grips of the new thinking which points to a way out of the crisis situation.

The time for the adoption of joint, responsible -- albeit compromise -- decisions is the most valuable time we still have. But it is passing quickly. The age of nuclear weapons is evidently the most rapid of all the ages world history has been through. That is why specific action is so essential. I will end by appealing for this.

On behalf of the CPSU and all Soviet people I send best wishes to the fraternal Czechoslovak people.

MORATORIUM, U.S. TESTS DISCUSSED ON 'TOP PRIORITY'

LD082046 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Sep 86

["Top Priority" program with Dr Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States American and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Dr Sergey Plekhanov, not further identified; presented by Vladimir Pozner]

[Text] [Pozner] Nothing really dramatic has happened over the past week. We have no special story to tell you except, of course, the 19th U.S. nuclear test, the 19th, that is to say, since the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, now over a year ago.

And, of course, while this is not surprising, the Americans have kept right on testing notwithstanding the offer to join in a nuclear test ban, I repeat, while this is not surprising it certainly is indicative, especially what with the new round of talks going on in Geneva and all the leaks, which have also now become something we are used to; all the leaks that accompany these rounds and leaks that seem to indicate that the United States has some new and very important proposals. In view of all that, I'd like to ask both of you to look at these events -- if we may call them that -- in light of what is happening today and in light, of course, of the continuing Soviet moratorium. Dr. Bogdanov, would you like to begin?

[Bogdanov] Yes, but, you know, Vladimir, my first reaction to what you have said just now is that we still are facing a lot of dramas in this world. Public, state dramas, private dramas, and I believe that Nevada test is just belonging to that kind of event. They are just going along the same way of modernizing and trying to produce more and more sophisticated, more accurate nuclear weapons just to destroy our poor world. So it's indicative in the way that still there is a prevailing group of people in Washington, in this administration, they think in terms of fighting and winning the nuclear war. That is the first indication for me, personally, of this test program.

Now, you have touched upon the very important event of the second round of talks in Geneva. My difficulty is, or my question is, what we should expect out of them? Of course, it's too early. Now we have a number of American linkages, usual linkages before any round of talks that allegedly there is substantial -- some people say -- change in American position. Some people say no, we are not satisified; but in any case even some figures were published in the American press what they are going with, what they're going to Geneva. But, you know, Nevada test and that mainstream in the American thinking, of this administration's thinking, makes me a little bit pessimistic about the second round of talks because I cannot imagine -- maybe I am wrong -- but still I cannot imagine how people who (?are) believing in nuclear war, people who are doing everything to produce more and more sophisticated, accurate weapons can come to Geneva with some substantial thing. If you have to give something to contradict me please try.

[Pozner] Yes, why not.

[Bogdanov] That's why it makes me little bit pessimistic. You know, I am making a direct link between Nevada test and the -- this coming round of talks in Geneva.

[Plekhanov] Oh, I agree with you that both these things reflect the attitude of the Reagan administration toward the problem of nuclear weapons, the arms race, the use of force in foreign policy, and a whole range of questions connected with nuclear weapons. I think that what we are witnessing now, er, well, I would say a radical difference between the approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States toward questions of war and peace and international security. I think it would be much better if the divergence, the difference between the two positions were not so great. And in Geneva a year ago, almost a year ago, we saw a little of bridging of the gap, coming together on some issues, at least in words. The statement signed by the two sides contained quite a few things which were very important.

But, you know, as we review what has been done by the Reagan administration since the Geneva meeting in November last year, we don't see really any real progress toward fulfilling the promises that were made there. In fact there was movement in the opposite direction.

I think that really the world is faced with a choice now: If it chooses to continue down the same road of the arms race we may be faced with a very real possibility of a nuclear war within the next, perhaps, a decade and a half, maybe we will not be able to survive before the year of 2000. And, what makes me very, very concerned about that is certain qualities which nuclear weapons are acquiring. They are becoming more and more accurate, and they're becoming more and more suitable for disarming strikes for what is called the first strike capability.

[Pozner] Are you talking about counterforce weapons?

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes. If there is a counterforce parity, I mean if both sides acquire counterforce potential then I think the probability of a nuclear war, even an accidental nuclear war, will become forbiddingly high. This is a situation which has never existed before, and if we allow this situation to arise in the next 10 or 15 years then I think we are pretty much down the road to oblivion. And that, that's what motivates the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament by the year of 2000. Now one must really sober up in this day and age and really face the situation honestly and squarely and say: Where are we going? Do we realize where we are going? And, therefore, when people say: Well, you know the Soviet disarmament program, it's not realistic, it's a pie in the sky. Now what is not a pie in the sky? I think it's very realistic because it faces up to the danger that we are confronted with and seeks to find a way out of this danger.

[Pozner] Would you say, would either of you say, that a nuclear test ban could play a significant role in lessening this danger because there have been some reactions in the United States to the effect that what we should be doing is talking about cutting back on nuclear arms and not talking about a test ban?

[Bogdanov] Let me put it that way: Suppose for a while that's okay. We cut -- and I hope one day we will do that -- we cut, but there is another, you know, problem with all that: if we cut without stopping modernizing existing...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Exactly.

[Bogdanov]...existing nuclear weapons, a so-called cut in those conditions would mean nothing, because if you replacing old nuclear weapons with new ones even to the ratio -- suppose 1:3 -- you will have more efficient one, nuclear warhead more accurate, with more destructive, you know, selective but destructive still, very destructive power, which will not only change anything in the existing, you know, danger but make that danger more imminent, because it may come to somebody's mind: Ah ha, I have such a precise weapon, with such a little damage, (?as they think); why I don't use it with these bloody Russians to make them to behave? Something like that, you know.

[Plekhanov] Perform a little surgery on the (?Russkies).

[Bogdanov] Perform a little surgery. That's why, that's why, why we are so so worried about this moratorium business, just not because it's very, very great, because it's really very dangerous in creating new weaponry, new weapons qualitatively different from what we have now. So what's use of talking about cutting without stopping to modernize?

[Plekhanov] Yes, that's my point.

[Pozner] You're saying that reductions are meaningless if they don't go hand in hand with something that stops modernization?

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes. That's my point. Yes, yes. [words indistinct]

[Plekhanov] I agree, and testing is meant to modernize nuclear weapons. This is what tests are for, not for making sure that the weapons have not rusted. Academician Bogdanskiy puts it quite clearly that, you know, a nuclear bomb is reliable for at least 130,000 years. And as a physicist, he is (?just) not worried that it'll get rusty and not explode when needed. So the tests that are being conducted in the United States are not conducted in order to make sure that the existing weapons are good enough; the tests are being conducted to create new weapons, more powerful, more accurate, more destabilizing and nuclear weapons, and nuclear powered lasers meant for the SDI. This is the purpose of the testing program, and I think that our desisting from testing, and the United States continuing the testing is increasing, makes it increasingly clear, what are the aims of the two sides in this business.

[Bogdanov] Now let me, let me add something to that, you know. Now, whatever you may say about how many tests we in reality had, now everybody is aware who is really responsible for the arms race. We have stopped our testing, we don't create new weaponry, they are doing it. Who is responsible? How they, they, they (?think) is absolutely clear.

[Pozner] Yes, but I'm not quite sure that I agree with you. It's clear to us, but I think there are many people to whom it is not clear because the Amerians have an argument that they have to keep on testing because the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States, that we have finished our round of testing, that in the seventies we had a great military buildup and now they're catching up, and therefore they have to keep on testing; and there are many Amerians who probably believe that.

[Plekhanov] Yes, but when the facts are brought into light it's very easy to come to the conclusion that the United States -- if it is just a matter of keeping a balance with the Soviet Union -- then the United States really does not need the current series of tests that it is conducting.

[Plekhanov] Well, because this isn't, this series, as I've said, is meant to increase the accuracy of the American...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] It creates, actually; they are needed to create a new generation of nuclear weapons.

[Pozner] A third generation.

[Bogdanov] Maybe third, (?in some ways), even a fourth generation.

[Pozner] Okay.

[Plekhanov] Well, the SDI is the next generation.

[Pozner] But let's get back to this particular argument. What would you say to the view that the United States lags behind the Soviet Union and therefore has to modernize? Now what would you say to that?

[Plekhanov] This view is simply not supported by facts. I've seen the facts and I just don't buy that view. We are at the same...at this time we are in a situation of rough parity. The U.S. Department of Defense, in its annual statements to the U.S. Congress, has recognized that repeatedly, even during the Reagan administration. So it's something that exists in rhetoric, in the imagination of some people, and in the willful misinterpretations of some people.

But the problem is not really who is ahead. The problem is that if we continue racing we will be dead within 15 or 20 years. It is a very real probability that the two sides will not be able to stop this race to oblivion, and therefore the Soviet Union has chosen to opt out of this arms race, and therefore we are proposing that by the year 2000 we must rid the world of nuclear weapons. Let's keep it as a goal. Let's not forget that this is possible, it's doable. It can be done provided there is political will in the West, and we hope that that will appear within the next year. In order to dramatize the seriousness and honesty of our commitment we have been withholding from nuclear tests. We are saying: Look, we've decided to stop. Please join us before it's too late.

[Pozner] The Americans say that if they don't test, then they cannot develop SDI, which is probably true.

[Bogdanov] Which is probably true, of course.

[Plekhanov] Well, our response is: Why develop the SDI?

[Pozner] So when we are calling upon the United States Administration to join us in a test ban we are also saying, by the same token, stop work on the SDI, are we not?

[Plekhanov] Well, work on SDI is illegal under the ABM treaty of 1972. We agree that some research on a defensive system is possible -- laboratory research -- because you can't really verify what is, what's happening there, of certain components and so on. But testing and deployment is very clearly forbidden by the ABM Treaty, which was signed by the two sides in 1972. And by the way, this is exactly why the Reagan Administration is trying to break the ABM Treaty, to get the United States out. And they want our cooperation in this business of destroying the ABM treaty, but I don't think they are going to get that cooperation. We think the treaty is in the interests of both sides, it should be kept.

[Pozner] So, in other words, what we come down to finally is that a test ban is probably the most important step towards -- leading towards -- nuclear disarmament.

[Bogdanov] You are quite right, Vladimir, and if the other side -- I mean our American counterpart -- is really serious about doing some substantial business in arms control, maybe that would be the best signal just being sent to us, that they are serious about them. You know that so far we haven't got any small sign of that.

[Pozner] A final question, then.

[Bogdanov] Yes?

[Pozner] A final question: If we find the United States, regardless of public opinion in the United States -- which supports the test ban, regardless of the House of Representatives, which at least supports a ban on any kind of tests over 1 kiloton -- if we find that the administration is going to go ahead and test anyway, tell me quite frankly and concisely, in as little time as possible, do we have any hope for the future if they refuse a test ban? Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] My answer is no, we have no hope.

[Plekhanov] I would respond in this way: The world did not start with this administration and it will not end with this administration.

U.S. SCIENTIST CITED ON VERIFYING MORATORIUM

LD081003 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 8 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kikilo:

Professor Thomas Cochran, chief geophysicist for seismographs of the U.S. National Resources Defense Council, has hailed the Soviet Union's latest extension of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions as a very useful and politically right step.

Speaking in a TASS interview, he said that the National Resources Defense Council together with the Soviet Academy of Sciences were conducting an experiment with the aim of proving that a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty was feasable and would be fully verifiable.

The technical aspects of the problem of verification and contral, the U.S. scientist said, could well be resolved, while the existing seismic equipment was quite capable of verifying a treaty of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear testing.

Cochran said the only thing needed now for the talks on a comprehensive nuclear test ban to be resumed was political will.

CDE DELEGATES RETURN HOME FOR 'CONSULTATIONS'

LD081952 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1900 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm disarmament conference, has returned home for urgent consultations. He was accompanied by the most important military person in the delegation, Colonel Viktor Tatarnikov.

Western circles believe that Grinevskiy and Tatarnikov will receive the final authorizations from Moscow for the concessions which will make an agreement possible at the Stockholm conference.

Reportedly, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has stated that the Soviet Union would accept the use of nonaligned and neutral countries' aircraft for inspection flights to help monitor the implementation of agreements concluded between states.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION -- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD060947 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Sep 86

["International Situation: Question and Answers" program, presented by Pavel Kasparov, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; with N.V. Shishlin and Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, not further identified; V.V. Peresada, international affairs journalist; and V. Fonarev, USSR Gosteleradio correspondent in Harare]

[Excerpts] [Kasparov] Greetings, esteemed listeners. I would like to begin today's discussion of current problems of international life with what is unquestionably the most important question of the present day -- the question of preserving peace in the world. Indeed, this is also your desire, dear listeners, and your letters on this theme come in a constant stream to us here at the radio. All of them without exception contain a high assessment and warm support for the new peaceloving initiative of our state in continuing to 1 January 1987 its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests. This step is a concrete demonstration of the new thinking in the nuclear age and also of the USSR's striving to create a new model of international realtions which would allow the arms race not to be forced onward but to be stopped and finally curbed, and allow the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe to be eliminated and thus to save mankind from destruction. This is the leitmotif of your letters.

However, alongside this, many of you ask the question: Will not such a long refusal to carry out nuclear tests while the United States is carrying out explosion after explosion have a negative effect on our defense capability; will this not lead to some sort of weakening of the USSR's positions at the military level and also to a certain extent at the political level? I shall ask Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, who is here in the studio, to reply to your question.

[Shishlin] These are very interesting questions. The alarm and worry shown by the comrades who write such letters is quite understandable. But, of course, this does not mean that I share this concern. This decision, as you know, was not an easy one for the Soviet leadership, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, because indeed the United States is not responding with reciprocity to the example of good will but is trying to step up its series of nuclear tests and is acting in every way in the attempt to break through to military superiority -- that is, to solve the task it has set for itself over the whole 6 years since the Reagan administration came to power.

But all the same, why does this concern not give sufficient grounds to require any state decisions? The main point here is that at present the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States is quite stable. When each side has the ability many time over to inflict on the other side what is called, in the language of military policy makers, unacceptable damage, then indeed it is of little significance if some extra quantity of missiles, nuclear warheads and so forth is added -- when in essence, mankind now has no chance of survival if a nuclear catastrophe breaks out.

This is the first thing, concerning the purely military sphere. Next, on the political level. We must not at all follow the principle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and copy the actions of the U.S. Administration in everything. When the Soviet leadership announced the need for new thinking and a new approach to solving international problems, this was no formula elaborated in someone's study, no abstract conclusion. It was a painful decision reached after deep consideration of the realities of the nuclear-space era in which we now live.

And these realities of the nuclear-space age require that suspicion be overcome, that fear be overcome and that distrust be overcome. How can this be done? Only by making progress in resolving key problems of international politics, precisely those questions connected with the consolidation of international security.

The simple, clearest, and most obvious step and one which is easily monitorable is precisely the cessation of nuclear tests. Did we propose to the United States before the moratorium that this problem should be solved? Yes, we did. The United States avoided this. When the USSR went in for a unilateral moratorium then, too, many voices were heard in the world that the USSR was taking a risk, since the United States was hardly likely to follow this example. But let us now have a look at who has won and who has lost; although, of course, here the categories of win and lose are not very precise. Yes, the United States was the pioneer and record holder in carrying out nuclear tests, and still holds these titles. But has there been any increase in the strength of the political position of the present U.S. Administration as a result of these nuclear tests? Of course not. Because the United States' own allies are beginning to cease to agree with the United States and its way of acting; not to mention the U.S. public -- the latest opinion polls show the 81 percent of Americans are in favor of a freeze on the nuclear arms race as a whole and in favor of ceasing nuclear tests. So, here, the positive political balance of the Soviet unilateral moratorium is quite tangible, quite real. But what is this positive political balance? This is not something purely speculative, either. It is in effect the prerequisite for a solution. It is a real factor of pressure on those conservative, militaristic circles in the United States who cling to tests, cling to the nuclear arms race and who cannot think at all outside the category of the so-callled policy of strength.

But the comrades are correct when they ask these questions in their letters that there are, of course, no simple decisions here. A very difficult and complicated and far from simple struggle is under way; and, of course, in this struggle one must have courage, will and reason in order to make progress. I think that it is extremely valuable that the USSR is making progress, not retreating, not taking a single step backward. That is, our strategic course, outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress is being maintained. It is pleasing that this course is meeting with increasingly broad support and understanding from the most varied political forces, not to mention the broad circles of the international public. [passage omitted]

[Kasparov] Now, I would like to move on to replying to your letters on the problems of the Near East. Many of you and, in particular, listener Markov from Podolsk; Nikolay Petrovich Rebrov from Ufa; Muratov from th town of Borzya, Chita Oblast, as to be told about the situation which has now arisen around Libya. I asked Vladimir Vasilyevich Peresada, journalist on international affairs, to answer your question. For a number of years he worked as PRAVDA correspondent in the Near East, and he knows the problems of this region well.

[Peresada] How can one describe everything that the United States is now undertaking around Libya? The facts show that we have here a virtually complete repeat of the scenario by which a bandit raid has already been made against that sovereign Arab country. Moreover, as the U.S. press writes, the new anti-Libyan operation that has been elaborated by Washington might be even larger in the scale of use of armed force than the previous one which was carried out last April.

By tradition, as one might say, the thesis of a Libyan threat to U.S. interests and to the lives of U.S. citizens is once again being used as a pretext for aggression. But now this thesis is being used with even greater shamelessness that before. Wholesale accusations are being made against Libya, not only of participation in the terrorist actions that have taken place in various states; in its preparations for yet another sally, the Washington administration is organizing press leaks of inventions about facts which the United States allegedly has about Tripoli's new terrorist intentions. That is, it inspires the appearance of lies it has itself produced in order to justify its planned aggression. Speakes, the White House assistant press secretary, for example, stated that we are ready at any moment to use the necessary measures against Libya. These threats are not just empty noises but are being backed up by practical measures. A large group of the 6th Fleet is already concentrated in the southern Mediterranean. Other formations of the U.S. naval forces are being moved there. Eighteen F-111 fighter-bombers have been urgently transferred across the ocean to U.S. air bases in Britain, in addition to the combat aircraft constantly based there. Their transfer is explained by their forthcoming participation in planned maneuvers. However, it was aircraft of precisely this type that were put into operation from U.S bases on the British Isles for the April raids on Libya. It is very likely that they could fly from there once again for the same purpose.

What is Washington seeking to gain by setting its sights on Libya once again? Judging from everything, it is seeking the same as in April. Let us recall that the main aim of that sally was described by the foreign press as being to shake the Al-Qadhdhafi government and to bring it down. This aim, which is in itself criminal as are the methods which were used to try to achieve it, was not achieved then. The Government of Libya did not renounce its anti-imperialist course and did not submit to U.S. dictate. Nor have Washington's hoped-for results been achieved by the political and economic sanctions against Tripoli. That is why the people across the ocean have decided once again to have recourse to gunboats and aircraft in order to teach Tripoli a lesson. At the same time, the people across the ocean demonstratively ignore the fact that Libya not only rejects Washington's accusations but also resolutely comes out against all forms of state terrorism. Libya is itself a victim of organized terror, the Tripoli newspaper AL-FAJR AL-JADID, for example, writes, and it is in its interests to put an end to such a policy on the international arena. 'Abd al-Salam Jallud, member of the revolutionary leadership of the Libyan Jamahiriyah, declared that we demand that the U.S. Administration presents to us and to the world community facts about the persons accused by Washington of terrorist activity. Otherwise, it will become clear to the whole world that such accusations are nothing more than insinuations and a pretext for the commission of aggression and that, in reality, the White House intends to punish Libya for its political and ideological concepts.

As the U.S. press admits, Washington does not have any data or proof of the existence of terrorist plans and it is unable to present any. But the attempt to implement them is fraught with a serious exacerbation of the situation not only in the Mediterranean. If the United States once again dares to strike against Libya it will bear a heavy responsibility for the consequences that this senseless act might entail.

[Kasparov] Vladimir Vasilyevich, I would like you to touch upon the situation in the Near East as a whole. By the way, we are asked about this by Volgograd teacher Lidiya Aleksandrovna Starogorskaya. And there is another letter from listener Blyudov from the town of Sendoba, Olonets Rayon, Karelian SSR. He asks to be told about Israel's provocative policy in that region, and he also considers that at the same time one must certainly mention U.S. complicity in Israel's crimes in the Near East.

[Peresada] Quite true. The U.S. hullabaloo around Libya, which I have just been talking about, is just one of the manifestations of U.S. policy of force over a wider region. I mean both the Mediterranean and the Near East. [passage omitted]

[Kasparov] Now, Vladimir Vasilyevich, I would like you to discuss ways of settling the problem of the Near East as a whole. We are also asked about this by listener Kumyshev from Nalchik. He is interested, in particular, in the role that could be played in this process by an international conference on the Near East which, as is known, is favored by our country.

[Peresada] A broad international conference of this sort could, it seems, open the way to an all-embracing and really reliable solution of the Near East problem. Such a solution requires, on the one hand, the elimination of the underlying reasons for the conflict, and on the other hand the taking into consideration of the rights and interests of the sides drawn into it. The substitution of honest collective efforts by seperate understandings between Israel and individual Arab countries, leads, as experience has shown, only to behind the scenes deals at the expense of other participants in the conflict. This was the case, for example, with the Camp David agreements and the Israel-Egyptian peace treaty which, as is known, did not resolve the situation but, on the contrary, complicated it and strengthened the anti-Arab positions of the aggressor and its protector.

It is precisely for this reason that Israel and the United States refuse to convene an international forum on the Near East and place their hopes in new separate deals. At the same time, the Arab countries are increasingly resolutely rejecting this path and increasingly loudly coming out in favor of a conference. As is known, the USSR is conducting a tireless and active struggle for convening it.

And in our opinion what sort of a mechanism for a settlement should be discussed at the conference? In the first place there is the need for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the granting of the right of self-determination and of creating their own independent state to the Arab people of Palestine. The right should also be ensured for all states of the region, including Israel, to secure and independent existence and development.

All interested sides including, of course, the Palestine Liberation Organization, should participate in the conference, for the PLO is widely recognized throughout the world as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. As far as concerns all sorts of separate decisions, I would like to stress once again that the USSR has always come out and still comes out against these political tricks which encroach upon the rights of the Arab peoples and promote only the further attention of the knotty problem of the Near East. [passage omitted]

APN 'ROUND TABLE' DISCUSSES GLOBAL PROBLEMS

PM051436 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 34, 24 Aug 86 pp 6-7

["A Round Table Discussion at the Novosti Press Agency," prepared by Sergey Martynov, with moderator Valentin Falin, Chairman of the Board of the Novosti Press Agency; USSR Academy of Sciences Africa Institute Director Anatoliy Gromyko; USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry Information Department head Gennadiy Gerasimov; USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute ...Professor Igor Bestvzhev-Ladu: USSR Academy of Science Institute...of World Economics and International Relations Director Yegeniy Primakov; publicist Reiner Falk; Bremen University Political Economy Professor Rudolf Hickel; and Marburg University Political Science Professor Reinhard Kuehnl: "Being and Consciousness in Nuclear Age"]

[Text] Questions Regarding the Immediate Future [V. Falin] The creation and upgrading of new types of arms are determining the situation which will prevail by the turn of the century. The Treaty of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons expires in a few years time. Will the treaty by extended? Will the countries which have been waiting for real progress towards banning and cutting nuclear weapons and which have not acceded to it want to? Today there are only five nuclear powers and we still can't agree on at least initial steps towards limiting and cutting nuclear weapons. How hard will the going be when there'll be more such powers?!

In undertaking armed aggression against Libya, the United States of America sought to consolidate the precedent it had set in Grenada. It is carrying on its policy of arbitrariness and an irresponsible attitude to international law and the principles underpinning world order. However relative it might be. What would happen if everyone started acting in this way? What would remain of international relations if any quite powerful state started acting in this way towards another state incapable of an effective rebuff? That would throw us back to the situation that existed in world relations at the turn of the last century. Regretfully, the double standards being introduced into internatonal practices are becoming some kind of markers in the USA. We are seeing the incarnation of what Bernard Baruch said: "We Americans are right because we are strong." Today the president or secretary or state insist that policy and diplomacy are the continuation of strength, which diplomacy cannot exist without. Never before has the cult of strength flourished so intensely in the U.S.

General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev stressed at the 27th Congress that objective conditions are taking shape, which dictate that relations between countries of different systems should develop in the form of peaceful cooperation and peaceful competition. In our age no conflict can be resolved militarily. For that, one has to again try to understand everything that is going on. one has to learn to think in a new way. Whereas before, despite the conficts and wars, humankind could entertain the idea of immortality, today we are denied that luxury. Nuclear weapons are no longer political weapons as they were billed before: they are real weapons to be used. The decision to use them can already be made not by people but by a computer or a radar. Humankind is becoming a hostage to the technologies it has created.

In the offing is a new technology that rests on totally different physical principles that fit neither nuclear nor conventional arms concepts.

But changes in the military sphere are not the whole story. Modern technological industrial processes require durable peace. Take nuclear power engineering. An APS [Atomic power station] of one million kilowatt is equal roughly to 200 nuclear bombs. Should it become a target of an attack, everything around the station would be turned into a dead zone. Considering the location of atomic power stations in Western Europe, it would become a dead zone. There is also the chemical industry. The accident at Seveso flashed the danger to us all everywhere. Dioxine is an extremely potent industrial poison, and a component part of chemical processes in practically all countries. It should be noted that if the poison is released, it would not decompose for 150 years. Many other intermediate products of chemical processes can make life impossible in many countries if they leak out and subsequently spread uncontrollably. On the other hand, it is impossible without nuclear power, without intensive chemical technology to solve the problems of the Third world countries, to give the people the normal life that they expect. For most countries in the world intensive, not extensive, development is an objective necessity. All intensive industrial technologies require stability and safety.

Today's Rivers Flow to Our Grandchildren

There are also ecological problems. Regretfully, they remain practically unsolved today. They are only being discussed. It is still unknown what impact the poisoning of the Baltic, Mediterranean, Black Seas, or vast areas of the world's oceans is going to have on future generations. Every minute thousands of hectares of forest and several varieties of insects and plants disappear on the planet. What are the consequences of this waste? If we fail to find ways and means of pooling efforts and minds, if we fail to persuade people to take a different approach to these matters, then the chances are that we will be the last happy generation to see the Earth as a place to live in.

Quantity also changes into quality. Thus the example of the Sahara, or of our Central Asian deserts, prove that far from everything can be put right again. The irrigation systems in Central Asia were ruined during Alexander the Great's campaigns and the Tatar-Mongol invasion. The former fertility and the structure of the lands could not be restored over two thousand years and, correspondingly, over one thousand years. As a result of the campaigns by the Persians against the Georgians in the 16th-17th centuries, vast tracts of forests in the Great Caucasus were destroyed and all attempts in the last century and in this century to restore them have come to nothing.

Finally, take the demographic problems. the number of so-called "expendable people" (those having no jobs, homes, practically no means of subsistence) is growing in the world every year. Before the century is out, they will number nearly one thousand million. What is humankind going to do about its fellow human beings? The most challenging global problem is that of ending the arms race, of ending the waste, and preventing self-destruction. Today's rivers flow to our grandchildren. What these rivers will be like depends on all of us. Our problems today and tomorrow directly depend on the level of our reasoning. Humankind has gained such power over nature that today not only does being determine consciousness but consicousness is beginning to increasingly determine being.

Only by All Humankind

[R. Kuehnl] The main peculiarity of our epoch is the principle of global interdependence. We can see the huge social and economic lag of the Third World countries. We can see the ever increasing threat to the ecological foundations of human kind's existence. We must provide food to the earth's increasing population, and this problem involves the development of sea and space resources. Those are global problems. This signifies that they can only be solved by all of human kind. The material potential of one individual country would not be adequate. The most important of these problems is preserving peace. A large-scale war would make the further existence of humankind impossible. In the material sense, peace is the prerequisite for solving all other problems. The arms race gobbles up people's material and intellectual resources. Thus the imperative of the nuclear age is not only the inadmissibility of war but also disarmament and international cooperation. This imperative should become a criterion for all political measures and for all social and philosophical concepts. Our goal is the creation of a broad coalition of reason, and the isolation of forces which think that wars can be waged for securing their own interests.

[I. Bestuzhev-Lada] Over recent decades we have been slipping towards another world war step by step and inch by inch. No one wants human kind to be destroyed. Nonetheless, everything that happéned during the Crimean War, World War I and World War II is being repeated step by step. On the basis of known facts and observations of all tendencies one can predict the destruction of humankind in the foreseeable future. Rather than being a prediction this is a logical continuation of the tendencies which we are observing. We have got problems that can and must be solved. But there is also normative forecasting which is based on a tree of objectives and determines optimal ways of reaching these objectives. Let's talk about the kind of a world we would like to live in.

Arms Race Is a Form of War

[R. Hickel] In the past politics alone could touch off a war. But today the technology of production of new types of weapons also harbours heretofore unknown dangers of starting a war. One example is the SDI concept of star wars. A number of scientists in the FRG have spoken out against accepting this programme. Even scientists of conservative views have pointed to the enormous risk of developing military technology as part of the star wars concept. The computer systems forming the basis of the programme are themselves a big war-provoking threat. Who is interested in this new spiral of the arms race and who is promoting plans for star wars? There has appeared in the sky a "feeding trough" for arms manufacturers. The question is how the structure of the industry itself should be changed to prevent the military-industrial complex from playing such a big role and from raking in such enormous profits. The peace marchers' answer can be found on their posters: "strategic initiative on environmental protection instead of the Strategic Defense Initiative". This also implies the creation of jobs and changing the vast spheres of industries over to peace-oriented, civilian needs, to ensure a peaceful future for them.

[V. Falin] The arms race, to be precise, is a form of waging war. In prenuclear history we can also find examples when certain problems were finally solved with the aid of an arms race, without shooting, but with the aid of violence.

We have come to a point where the differences between a policy of violence and a policy from strength are practically indistinguishable. This is what they in the Pentagon call waging a war in peacetime.

Arms Race or Development

[R. Falk] I read with interest the part of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15 mentioning that Third World nations are interested in a disarmament process. There is a direct link between the arms race and the ever growing mass poverty in the Third World countries. The arms race soaks up vast funds which could be otherwise channelled into meeting human needs both in the industrialized and developing countries. How can this be done? On the one hand, a growing number of people in international organizations and in western countries are coming to realize the necessity of winding up the arms race in order to get a chance to solve mankind's social problems. On the other hand, we see a lack of political willingness to really solve these problems.

What is happening is an export of militarism along various channels to Third World countries, with arms exports playing a major part. While the policy of militarism and confrontation spearheaded against developing countries is getting tougher, these countries are being dragged into economic straits. Take, for example, their foreign debts. Since 1973 Third World countries have been paying industrialized countries more to cancel their debts than they have received from them. In addition to this new debt mechanism, there are still some old mechanisms like the economic enslavement of these countries by the multinationals and discrimination in trade. All that necessarily causes further worsening in relations, and lends vigour inside developing countries to the new opposition to the economic pressure from the industrialized countries.

[V. Falin] Let's put the matter in a sharper perspective. Supposing we had achieved a decrease in the arms race and part of the funds thus released went to the developing countries. Would that solve the Third World's problems? The US gets an average of $150 billion a year along from exploiting the Third World. Is it realistic to believe that Americans would give back to these countries the money saved on the arms race? Or are the arms race and tensions vital to the continued exploitation of the poor countries economically, which enables America to maintain its living standard? Continued poverty of other nations is used as a lever to maintain its own living standard. The new econoiic order clamoured for by the Third World and which is being maintained by the USSR and democratic forces in other countries runs contrary to US essential interests.

Let's Consider Various Concepts

[R. Ruehnl] What forces can be involved in peace campaigning? Does the USSR have any new ideas on identifying these forces? The vision of the world by one public force or another depends on their concepts. There are two totally opposing concepts. One is a concept of peaceful coexistence taking account of the fact that the world is a unity of opposites. Differences within it are interconnected and should be resolved peacefully for this reason.

The other concept is neoconservative and is followed by the Reagan administration. It is based on two main premises. First, given will and determination, one can well achieve one's goals by waging a war. Second, the world is viewed as a conglomeration of global antagonisms, and one can only achieve one's goals by preventing the other side from achieving its own. If put bluntly, this subjectivist and extremist concept sounds this way: either he or I, either evil or good.

There are also other concepts. Social-reformists, for example, which reflect bourgeois consciousness and bourgeois class interests, but which don't rule out compromise. And this is of great significance to trade unions in the capitalist countries. There is also a concept of the middle sections of the population. In the past, these sections could, on frequent occasions, be persuaded to take the side of the supporters of war because they hoped they would get a share of the war booty and prove their superiority over the other nations and races. Now both these reasons have been discarded because of the advances in war technology. Pacifist movements have emerged. A liberal concept is that superiority can only be proved in peaceful competition. Incidentally, among conservatives, too, there are prerequisites for a new approach to solving the peace or war question. I am referring to their pragamtism which favours opposition rather than destruction.

There is an interesting concept of defence of national interests. In western Europe it could be a brake on the implementation of the USA's aggressive plans. This much has been shown by the discussion around the SDI. Unlike the case with the deployment of nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries, it has now become obvious that a negative reaction to the SDI is characteristic for different sections, including governments, as is the case with the French Government.

[Ye. Primakov] The concept of peaceful coexistence is indeed a unity of opposites. At the 27th CPSU Congress it was stressed that these opposites exist and develop in a single context. A line should be drawn between the neoconservative concept held by Reagan and the conservative concept. We cannot say that everybody in Washington is a neoconservative, i.e., a person who believes that all questions should be resolved through strength. Furthermore, it does not apply to West European leaders. The conservatives are now clearly divided into so-called idealist conservatives, or more accurately, ideological conservatives, and pragmatists. This division may become even wider. Our foreign policy strategy takes into account this division and the emergence in the future of more pragmatic leaders.

Ideological conservatives see as their goal the need to end socialism and subordinate to it their political actions. Pragmatists, while they oppose socialism, do not aim to end it through use of force. Social reformists can be our partners in campaigning for peace, ending tensions, banning nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction. We are prepared to cooperate with them.

[G. Gerasimov] The main thing is to see how people understand differences between socialism and capitalism. Let's speak of the game theory. If one takes a view of the conflict between socialism and capitalism as being expressly antagonistic, as being a zero-sum game, if one sees the conflict exclusively as being black and white, as a struggle between good and evil, one would arrive right at the neoconservative position.

If the differences between socialism and capitalism are viewed as a plural game, as a conflict where the opponents have some common interests, like playing according to the rules, keeping peace, then we can also put under this umbrella the concept of peaceful coexistence and the numerous political movements, since their proclaimed goals are only reachable in conditions of peace.

Following the rule of Frederick the Great

[V. Falin] Neoconservatives essentially follow a rule attributed to Frederick the Great: "If you happen to like your neighbour's land, take it, and there will be a hundred lawyers willing to prove that you are right." The ideology of conservatives is not the initial cause for their actions but a front designed to lend a measure of decency to their predatory interests in this case. Fascism minced no words, saying cynically: destroy all these subhumans. Today's conservatives talk about human rights, democracy, diplomacy. To give an example, neoconservatives speak about good and bad Communists. If some group in the USA bases itself on selfishness, this cannot be called idealism.

It is wrong to try and place the Greens, the ecologists or the feminists somewhere between conservatism and some left-wing movements simply on the strength of old ideas, old simplistic categories. The thing is that many of these movements are protest movements. The amount of protest in the minds of their participants is greater than the amount of desire for a constructive approach. For example, the Greens offer solutions to some problems and say, in fact, that the other problems cannot be solved. Try to solve the problems of the Third World proceeding from the "Back to nature" concept! This element of protest contains in it a powerful charge of negating all that was in the past, all that failed to primarily solve the questions of war and peace. But this protest does not always offer an answer as to what the next move should be. Nonetheless, I am totally in favour of taking an attentive and objective look at all new public movements, especially those rooted in a broad social base.

The Ecological Bomb

[A. Gromyko] I can see three bombs planted under our home, the earth. The first is the arms race, the recond is relations between the rich and poor countries or between the North and the south, as some people say, and, lastly, there are the ecological problems. A fourth problem of new political thinking in the nuclear age. Hegel said that Minerva's owl starts to fly at twilight. He meant to say that human reason usually falls behind human actions and that people are only wise after the events.

[V. Falin] The most urgent ecological problems are those linked with the technological policy decided on and being carried out. Take the massive destruction of forests in Brazil, the "green lungs" of the western hemisphere, or the cutting down of forests in Africa, in the south of Asia and in Indonesia, or the continued and even increased pollution of the seas and oceans. In the long term the problem has two aspects. One is a military one, the other is related to the realization of economic programmes. The military aspect falls into two parts. We are yet to find out what the war in Vietnam will finally produce. According to scientists' estimates, the ecological changes in the areas of intensive combat actions conducted by the US can touch off an ecological catastrophe by the end of this century or the start of the next.

The second part of the military impact on nature consists in the ongoing research in genetics and biology, which is liable to have irreversible consequences. And, regretfully, the Soviet proposals tabled at the United Nations over the last 15 years on banning this type of military and applied-military research have not been met with due support. Let me stress: people might engineer their own invisible death and no antidote will be found!

As regards industrial impact on the environment, there should be at least cooperation on the regional basis. What is meant is not only combatting harmful emissions which directly affect people and plants. Indeed, excessive emissions of heat, carbon dioxide which result in the hothouse effect can make a profound impact on nature in a matter of decades or even centuries. Or taking excessive amounts of potable water and heat from the earth which can start climatic changes over areas comprising hundreds of thousands of square kilometres. Things are so interrelated on Earth that if something goes wrong in one area, there might be catastrophic consequences in a totally different area. We still do not seriously consider the impact made by modern aircraft on the upper layers of the earth's atmosphere, which keep back cosmic and other types of radiation. People act extremely unwisely in this area due to insufficient knowledge. They act without taking any precautions. Our descendants will recall Spinoza's words in the 17th century: "Ignorance is no argument".

Instead of summing up

[V. Falin] We should objectively recognize that a war is suicide and that violence is not a method of solving problems. The difference between the American and the Soviet approach to the problem of war and peace is this. The Americans intend to use the SDI to create safe conditions for the continuation of their policy of violence. Our policy is aimed at making violence impossible not just in relations between the USSR and the USA but also between any groups of states. No one knows whether it will succeed or not, but humankind's future depends on it.

CORRESPONDENT VIEWS U.S. TIES WITH NATO ALLIES

LD061530 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Correspondent Nikolay Borin responds to questions by announcer Ivan Sedov]

[Text] [Sedov] As you probably know, the leader of the Social Democratic Party, David Owen, and the Liberal Party Leader, David Steel, have met in Brussels General Bernard Rogers, Commander in chief of NATO troops in Europe. Here in the studio with me is Nikolay Borin. Nikolay, after he met the general, Dr Owen said that Bernard Rogers had shown concern about the positions on military matters held by certain parties in Western Europe, and he described them as a wrong signal to Moscow. Now, what do you think he meant by that?

[Borin] What this American general had in mind was undoubtedly the British Laborist position, first of all. The Laborists' objections to the Trident program and participation in the star wars project is a so alarming signal for Washington that it is ready to present it as some form of gesture to Moscow.

But when the prime minister's car is pelted with eggs in Barrow, where she was opening ceremonies for the construction of the first Trident, you can see that the Labor decision only reflects the mere fact that the nuclear policy of the present cabinet is very unpopular with Britons.

[Sedov] Does Rogers' talks with Owen and Steel mean that NATO is trying to meddle in British home policy?

[Borin] Yes, absolutely. But it is slightly naive to ask this question. This interference is not a campaign of sorts; it is a permanent interference, and the American leaders have got used to U.S. strategic interests being immune to political pendula swings in Whitehall. However, the situation is changing. Margaret Thatcher's policy conflicts with the very idea of nuclear disarmament. London is showing a negative attitude to the most pressing issues of reducing tension, including the problem of banning nuclear tests. And this position has become so unpopular that Britain's main opposition party can but pay attention and bear it in mind the course of the political struggle with an eye for the election. But the labor movement in Britain has long political trends of their own that have nothing to do with either Moscow or Washington, and these trends are largely based on the principles of relaxation of tension; and Moscow undoubtedly prefers them to the arms race.

[Sedov] Does it mean that the Laborists may prove NATO's weak link, as was hinted by Mr Rogers?

[Borin] No; they are, if you want, NATO's most realistic element today, and you should bear in mind that political pluralism in Europe has always irritated Washington. Washington has always wanted to reduce Western Europe to the same denominator. Johannes Rau, who leads now the main opposition party in Federal Germany, he said that friendship implies equality. In fact, he had gained some experience of relations with America, where no allowance is made for the obedient; they are treated with poorly concealed contempt. And Rau added: I know from my own experience he who never says no has quickly enough to take part in anything. [as heard] And the Tory foreign policy bears out these observations by Mr Rau. So it is obvious what gives Washington an uncomfortable feeling is the fact that a number of major opposition parties in Western Europe have their own opinion. Washington would like all the Europeans to jive with the American position in NATO, not the other way around. But this is already Gen Rogers' headache.

INTERNATIONAL SEA SAFETY MEETING OPENS IN LONDON

LD082303 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] London September 8 TASS- The regular 53rd session of the Committee for Safety in the Sea of the International Maritime organization opened here today. It is attended by delegations from some 40 countries. The agenda of the session includes questions connected with measures for ensuring safety in the sea. Specifically, they will discuss the improvement of methods of notification in case of accidents in the sea and the improvement of communication facilities, including satellite communication, during rescue operations. The session will also discuss the combating of terrorism in the sea.

IZVESTIYA: MORE DETAILS ON DANILOFF CHARGE

PM081615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 6

[V. Krotov article: "Charges Filed"]

[Text] On 7 September 1986 the USSR KGB investigator together with the military prosecutor officially charged U.S. citizen Nicholas Daniloff, detained 30 August 1986 while committing a secret espionage act, with perpetrating a crime under Article 65 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

The charge states that sufficient evidence has been gathered in the case of Nicholas Daniloff, Moscow correspondent of the American journal U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, who was born in 1934, to justify the claim that, being linked with U.S. special services and on their orders, and taking advantage of his status as foreign correspondent in the Soviet Union, he engaged in espionage by using various methods to gather secret information to be used to the detriment of the Soviet Union's national interests.

Having familiarized himself with the document, Nicholas Daniloff reluctantly signed it and acquired a status that is new for him: From being a suspect he had become the accused.

...The day of 30 August turned out to be a very busy one for Nicholas Daniloff. Much had to be done before the approaching completion of his tour of duty in the USSR and his forthcoming departure from Moscow. Nothing, however, was more urgent than an imminent important meeting which he awaited impatiently. The day before, Daniloff had received a telephone call from an old acquaintance:

"This is Frunze! Meet me at the same place. At 1100. Agreed?"

"Of course, of course! No question about it," the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT journalist hastened to reassure his mysterious interlocutor.

At 1100 precisely Nicholas Daniloff stopped at the entrance to the "Leninskiy Prospekt" subway station. He waited for a minute or two, then started pacing nervously backward and forward, looking closely at the faces of passersby. He held in his hands a crumpled plastic package with a faded picture on it.

"Ah, there you are, Misha," Daniloff exclaimed. He was approached by the young man whom the U.S. journalist had been awaiting so impatiently.

"Brought it?" Daniloff fired the question like a shot.

"Of course, as promised...."

"Let's go then."

And, turning into a side alley of the square, the two quickly made their way toward the bank of the Moskva River.

They passed the fencing around the Central Park, crossed beneath the arches of the iron bridge of the Circular Railway where, as if by some irony of fate, intelligence agent Martha Peterson had been caught with a selection of deadly poisons for her agents, and halted by a lush willow tree which gave them cover with its abundant greenery. What happened then? Nicholas Daniloff describes it personally:

"I gave Misha several books, while he gave me the black package with which I was detained. I saw in the investigator's office that it contained -- in addition to newspaper clippings -- photographs, plans, and maps with military installations marked on them, as well as other information of a military nature. This was an unexpected and unpleasant revelation for me..."

Really, Mr Daniloff, "unexpected" and "unpleasant"?

Nicholas Daniloff's name has been known for a long time among representative of the corps of foreign journalists accredited in Moscow. In 1961-64 he was a UPI correspondent, then he disappeared for a long time only to reappear in the USSR after changing his journalistic "cover" at the last minute. Many of his colleagues in Moscow grimaced with displeasure whenever Daniloff's name was mentioned: What, him? And they often made it clear that they had nothing in common with him. And all this did have its own logic. It was described by Misha, Daniloff's "source" who was detained together with him.

"I met Nicholas Daniloff in March 1982 in Frunze, which he was visiting for a few days. I was approached in the 'Ala-too' Restaurant lobby by a puny guy of average height in massive horn-rimmed eyeglasses who introduced himself as an American correspondent. He said that it was his first time in the area and he would very much like to get to know the life of my republic. The time flew by while we chatted, and we parted on friendly terms, agreeing to meet the next day. I promised to show my new acquaintance the city and its sights.

"'Try not to bring any KGB men,' Daniloff said half-jokingly, half-seriously. I promised...

"My contacts with Daniloff continued and I became more and more convinced that the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT journalist was quite different from what he had himself out to be.

"'Try to describe classifed [rezhimnyy] enterprises in Frunze;

"'Supply photographs of military equipment being used in Afghanistan;

"'Provide home addresses and indicate the places of work of demobilized soldiers who fought in Afghanistan;

"'Obtain information about the deployment and numbers of military subunits preparing to leave for Afghanistan....'

"I got the impression that Daniloff was not interested in anything except secret information, on obtaining which he always lauded the Western way of life and belittled everything Soviet."

And then the last meeting between the "friends" by the willow tree on the bank of the Moscow River. We quote from the Daniloff investigation statement, which says: "When the black package was opened it was found to contain"

"1. Part of a map of Afghan territory with hand-written symbols in the form of conventional signs indicating the deployment of Soviet Army military formations (stamped 'Secret');

"2. A hand-drawn plan of an area of the territory indicating where military equipment was located (stamped ' Secret');

"3. Twenty-six monochrome photographs depicting models of military equipment and Soviet Army officers and men."

Why did the journalist from U.S NEWS & WORLD REPORT need this information? Surely his employer -- the magazine's owner, with whom Daniloff met when he was already in the KGB Investigation Section -- did not ask him for it?

Mikhail's testimony and the materials in the black package belonging to the "journalist" Daniloff are by no means the only evidence which the investigation has at its disposal. A number of witnesses have been questioned about the case and have convincingly indicated other facts testifying to Daniloff's espionage activity. It may seem paradoxical but U.S. intelligence reinforced the conviction of the competent organs that in Nicholas Daniloff Soviet people were dealing with a man closely linked with the U.S. special services. Is proof needed? Help yourself. Here is some -- a letter which CIA staffer Stombaugh, subsequently expelled from the USSR, personally handed to a Soviet citizen named Roman.

"Dear and esteemed friend," we read in the document, "we wish to assure you that the letter which you sent to the journalist 24 January arrived at the address you had indicated. We value your work highly...."

It remains to be added that this journalist was the same Nicholas Daniloff, who passed the aforesaid letter to the intelligence services.

And then everything proceeded just as in a mediocre detective novel: There were dead drops, recognition signs, and contact meetings....

Is proof needed? It exists....

DANILOFF ARREST LINKED TO ANTI-SOVIET HYSTERIA

LD081730 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 8 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Pavel Kasparov]

[Text] A report from the United States of America says that the incident concerning the U.S. journalist, Nicholas Daniloff, arrested in Moscow, is, as they say, being forcibly whipped up there now. The mass information organs across the ocean are literally bending over backward in order to prove the supposed stupidity of the Soviet accusations against this employee of the U.S. special services who was arrested in Moscow and charged with espionage.

It is becoming quite obvious that despite logic and common sense, as well as the available irrefutable evidence, certain circles in the United States are trying to use the arrest and the charging of the U.S. pseudojournalist as a pretext for the latest progpaganda hysteria aimed against the USSR.

ARMACOST THREATENS 'DIPLOMATIC RETRIBUTION'

LD081412 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] Now a few notes by our commentator Aleksandr Druzhinin about the propaganda noise raised in Washington over the arrest in Moscow of the correspondent of the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Nicholas Daniloff.

Nicholas Daniloff was caught spying, caught redhanded so to speak, so what is all the noise about? His case is being handled by a competent Soviet authority, but just witness Washington's reaction to this banal case of espionage. The spokesman for the White House, posing both as investigator and judge, has declared categorically that Daniloff is absolutely innocent, and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Michael Armacost has even gone so far as to threaten the Soviet Union. To listen to that high-ranking official of the Reagan administration the failure of the ill-starred spy has jeopardized the very future of American-Soviet relations. Armacost has threatened Moscow with diplomatic retribution. He has given it to understand that if any measures are taken against Daniloff in accordance with the Soviet law all contacts between the two countries will be in question, including consultations of such key issues as the limitation of nuclear arms.

Let's disregard the tone of Armacost's statement, although it is quite surprising that Washington still doesn't realize that the Soviet Union won't have anybody speak with it the language of threats and pressure. The question is what is the purpose of the American propaganda outcry? It is obvious that the noise has been raised deliberately to provoke a new wave of anti-Soviet hysteria. Some circles in Washington clearly fear a normal development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and to bedevil them they are ready to seize at any excuse, even if it's only a common case of spying.

'REJOINDER' HITS SPEAKES REMARKS ON LEAKS

PM090849 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 86 Second Edition p 4

[B. Orekhov "Rejoinder": "Everything Flows, But Not Everything Changes..."]

[Text] Life is getting easy for American newspapermen. Barely a day goes by without a new leak of information "from above." First to one newspaper, then to another. First from one responsible staffer in the Washington administration, then from another. It seems there is no longer any need for the journalists to work hard for their daily bread, leaving no stone unturned in their quest for information in Washington's offices. Secret after secret, "leaking" out of these offices, flows into their hands.

Righteous indignation could be heard in the speech by White House spokesman L. Speakes the other day, when he attacked the anonymous author of the latest "lead." "We condemn those administration staffers who divulge information," he declared, shattering the air. "The violation of the principle of confidentiality leads to the wrecking of the

opportunity to achieve successful results in the arms control process. We should ask about the motives of these people. Their actions damage the President, the American people, and the cause of world peace."

After uttering this high-flown tirade and castigating the disobedient, Speakes presumably sighed with relief at having done his duty.

The food for this angry speech was provided by Michael Gordon's article in THE NEW YORK TIMES. It contained a detailed, well informed enumeration of the elements which, the newspaper said, will form part of the new American proposal at the strategic arms talks. The article cited the new ceilings on the total number of warheads on land- and sea-based ballistic missiles and on the number of warheads on solely land-based missiles, and much more.

But let us not be carried away by the content of the "leak." That is not the point.

In the speech cited above, Speakes was lavish with inspired words in evaluating the strategic arms talks which resume this month in Geneva exuding optimism, he spoke of the stimulus to the talks which is supposedly provided by the U.S. quest for areas in which the two sides can achieve progress. Of the importance of the principle of confidentiality...

Let us dwell on this and see what the crux of the matter is. Speakes' righteous indignation is nothing but a stunt, to which the White House has resorted before. It is designed not so much to convince people that the administration is not involved in the continuous "leaks," as to distract public attention from the continuing nuclear explosions on the Nevada ranges and get out of joining the Soviet moratorium and signing an agreement on ending nuclear tests this year. That is the main purpose of the vaudeville which has just been performed on the Washington stage.

In connection with Speakes' verbal fireworks, ABC television reported that this information leak was perpetrated by those who do not want to see a rapprochement in the U.S. and Soviet positions and are seeking in this way to prevent it. ABC is accurate in its assessment of what happened. The only question is: Who is trying to "prevent rapprochement," that is, to prevent the elaboration of concrete accords on curbing the arms race? Some malicious officials in Washington? Or perhaps -- this is closer to the truth -- simply the administration itself?

Everything flows, everything changes, the philosopher said. Confidential information flows from within the American administration. What does not change is the policy of the administration, which goes to any lengths to avoid stopping nuclear tests.

U.S. POLICY TERMED 'ECONOMIC BLACKMAIL'

LD051659 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 4 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

The independent policy of non-aligned countries does not suit Washington. Following the economic blackmail with regard to Zimbabwe, Washington took a discriminatory action against another non-aligned country, India. At first, the U.S. Administration refused to sell India the computers it needs to set up a system of warning about natural disasters: Hurricanes and tidal waves that inflict vast damage on India's economy every year.

And when India decided to buy such computers from Japan, Washington, as the newspaper YOMIURI writes today, demanded that its Asian partner impose the toughest of restrictions on the deliveries of Japanese technology to India. Washington explained this demand by the fact that India conducts the policy of friendship with socialist countries. Moreover, a secret meeting of Japanese and American experts will be held in Tokyo in September. The meeting is to work out concrete measures for restrictions on the deliveries of electronic equipment to India and other countries.

Washington's new actions of economic blackmail evoked justifiable indignation in non-aligned countries. A spokesman for the Zimbabwean Government said that the United States will be unable to intimidate Zimbabwe and compel it to conduct a policy suiting Washington. India resisted the U.S. pressure, too. The Japanese Governmental circles and particularly business circles are not at all enthusiastic over the U.S. action. They regard the supplies of electronic equippent to India and other countries as a commercial business. The United States discriminatory actions against Zimbabwe and India show that Washington intends to continue conducting its policy of pressure on states that chose an independent course in their foreign and home policy and Washington's attitude cannot but cause the indignation of the peoples of non-aligned countries.

TALYZIN DISCUSSES BILATERAL TIES IN RECEPTION SPEECH

LD081744 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Beijing, 8 Sep (TASS) -- Today Yao Yilin, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and vice premier of the PRC State Council, gave a reception in honor of Nikolay Talyzin, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who has arrived here for an official visit at the invitation of the PRC Government, and his entourage. In their speeches Yao Yilin and Nikolay Talyzin noted the appreciable positive changes which have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations in recent years. They expressed satisfaction with the development of mutually advantageous ties and contacts between the two countries in various spheres and the steady growth of trade and economic cooperation. However, Yao Yilin declared, what we have done so far still does not match the immense potential opportunities of our two great neighboring countries. He said: We still have much to do, and we must do it.

He expressed the conviction that Nikolay Talyzin's visit would contribute to the further development and expansion of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in various areas. As far as our economic relations are concerned, Yao Yilin stressed, we will act in accordance with the principle of supplementing each other's needs, which is in keeping with the interests of construction in the two countries. The Chinese people, he noted, are doing their utmost to carry out the socialist modernization of their country and to implement the economic reform.

A traditional friendship exists between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union. The Chinese people are very attentively following the socioeconomic changes currently taking place in the Soviet Union. An exchange of experience and views between the two countries on the restructuring of economic machinery is useful for both countries, Yao Yilin said.

In his speech Nikolay Talyzin said that the Soviet people are living under the sign of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and working on a restructuring of the socialist economic mechanism.

The main aim of the Soviet Union's foreign policy strategy, he noted, is to provide the Soviet people with the possibility of working in conditions of peace. Our country considers that its very first duty is to do everything it can to safeguard a peaceful future for the world. We oppose the U.S. plans for "star wars" with a program of "star peace". Nikolay Talyzin recalled that the Soviet Union has again extended until 1 January 1987 the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

A large part of Soviet territory, the speaker continued, is located to the east of the Urals. It is natural for us an Asian and Pacific Ocean state to strive to stabilize the situation in this region. In his 28 July speech in Valdivostok Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pur forward a program for creating favorable prerequisites for achieving that aim. Having noted that the Soviet Union and China have similar tasks in the area of maximum utilization of the advantages of socialism, Nikolay Talyzin declared: The Soviet people sincerely wish to live in peace and friendship with the people of socialist China, our great neighbor. We are convinced that we have objective prerequisites for an expansion of spheres of mutual understanding.

The stable movement of Soviet-Chinese relations along the path of friendship and good-neighborliness, and development of all-round cooperation on the foundations of equality and mutual benefit would respond to the basic interests of the USSR and the PRC, would promote an improvement in the international situation, arise in the role of socialism in international affairs, and a strengthening of the cause of peace and stability in Asia and all over the world.

PRC TRADE GROUP ENDS KAZAKHSTAN TALKS

LD081327 Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN in Kazakh 21 Aug 86 p 3

[Text] A cordial meeting held in Alma-Ata of the Vostokintorg Foreign Trade Association, ministries and departments of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, regions and oblasts of the RSFSR, and an export-import company of the PRC Xinjiang-Uygur Autonomous Region, completed its work 19 August. It was aimed at development of trade between neighboring regions of the Soviet Union and China.

An agreement was signed on a variety of products, including textile, consumer technology and mineral fertilizers from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenistan, Altay and Krasnoyarsk Krays, and Kemerovo Oblast.

It was pointed out at the meeting that the further development of trade and economic relations between the USSR and the PRC has strengthened the friendly relations between the Soviet and Chinese people.

During the meeting, it was agreed to organize an exhibition showing the industrial goods, agricultural machinery, consumer technology, and products of light and local industry. It is planned to open this exhibition in Urumqi, the capital of Xinjiang-Uygur Autonomous Region next year.

U.S. PACIFIC MANEUVERS SEEN AS 'PROVOCATIVE'

PM090744 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Sep 86 Second Edition p 5

[Igor Latyshev "Commentator's Column": "Tension Being Fueled"]

[Text] Recent days have been marked by feverish Pentagon activity on the seas. This has been particularly noticeable in the Far East, where the U.S. Armed Forces Pacific command is getting ready to hold large-scale maneuvers soon close to the coastline of the Soviet Union.

Ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet are assembling in the area of the Korea Strait to that end: 14 of them, including the battleship New Jersey, are making their way there from the Japanese port of Sasebo. According to press reports, a total of more than 30 warships, including the nuclear-powered aircraft carriers Carl Vinson and Ranger, missile-carrying cruisers, and nuclear-powered submarines, will be taking part in the upcoming maneuvers. On board some of them are Tomahawk cruise missiles capable of carrying nuclear charges. Never before in peacetime has this region seen such a concentration of U.S. naval might.

Why, then, has the American squadron gone there? Foreign observers maintain that its appearance indicates the implementation of a new U.S. military strategy -- the strategy declared in Anchorage the other day by Secretary of the Navy John Lehman. It envisages the buildup of the American fleet in the northwestern part of the Pacific.

This ostentatious cranking up of the American fleet's intrigues is also clearly aimed at impeding the trend toward a relaxation of international tension and a curbing of the arms race which has manifested itself so clearly in the public mood in the countries of West Europe, the Asian and Pacific region, and indeed the United States under the impact of Soviet peace initiatives. Moreover, the Pentagon is impatient to turn Japan into a kind of Far Eastern flank of NATO and finally rob the Japanese of any hope of their country avoiding embroilment in the arms race. In this connection the peace-loving Japanese public regards the maneuvers not only as a threat to peace but a quite obvious breach of Japan's three non-nuclear principles. The American military's schemes are also aimed at preventing the idea strengthening in the public opinion of Japan and the other Pacific countries that the region be turned into a peace zone free of nuclear weapons and military confrontation.

In this situation the Japanese public regards the upcoming maneuvers as a provocative show of force. The indignation and alarmed expressed by it with regard to the American fleet's arrial is wholly understandable. The interests of the peoples of the Far East urgently demand that a spirit of good-neighborliness rather than a militarist fever whipped up by the Pentagon should prevail in the region.

COMMENTARY NOTES JAPAN'S PROTEST AGAINST RSA TIES

MB080540 Moscow In English to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Yuriy Rogov Commentary]

[Text] Japan is South Africa's second trade partner after the United States.

So far there has been a steady growth in trade between South Africa and Japan. In the first half of this year alone, the total sum of South African commodites exported to Japan rose by more than a quarter as compared with the same period last year. It comprised an imposing sum of over 31 billion. Japan's exports to South Africa have been growing even faster.

Protests are mounting in that country against the continuation of economic ties with South Africa, with which, incidentally, Japan does not have diplomatic ties. On the eve of [Foreign Minister Roelof] Botha's arrival, representatives of the main opposition groups protested to the Japanese Foreign Ministry against the visit by Pretoria's envoy to the country.

During the 1-hour talks between the two ministers, demonstrations by Tokyo demanded that Botha leave the country. It is obvious that the Japanese government has been [words indistinct] to public opinion inside the country at a time when South Africa is being increasingly isolated in the world. It is also obvious that Roelof Botha has ignored his counterparts [words indistinct] attempts to persaude the South african envoy to carry out democratic reforms in his country. To [words indistinct] Botha's [words indistinct] the Japanese Government's [word indistinct] to South Africa will show what its declarations are really worth during the next 2 weeks.

JAPANESE GENERAL MEETS WITH U.S. ADMIRAL HAYES

LD081037 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo September 8 TASS -- Admiral Hays, commander of U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, called on Japan to increase its contribution to U.S. military preparations in The Far East. At a meeting held yesterday in Honolulu (Hawaii) with Yuko Kurihara, director general of the Defence Agency, who arrived there en route to Washington, he insisted that Tokyo increase its appropriations for the upkeep of U.S. troops stationed on the Japanese isles and grant the Pentagon another base for the training of jet [as received] based on U.S. Seventh Fleet aircraft carriers. According to the KYODO agency, Kuribhara treated the admiral's demands with "understanding."

BRIEFS

Joint Japanese Convention Held -- Moscow September 5 TASS -- By its decree of September 3, 1986 the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet ratified the convention between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of Japan on avoiding double income taxation, which was signed in Tokyo on January 18, 1986. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 5 Sep 86]

NAJIBULLAH SPEAKS ON PLANNED TROOP WITHDRAWAL

LD082054 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Kabul September 8 TASS -- A massive public rally devoted to the new Soviet peace initiatives was held in the Afghan capital today. Party and state figures, members of the general public and guests from abroad took part in it. "In the 20th century, said Najibullah, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, "our northern neighbor, the Soviet Union, heads the sacred struggle for peace. From Lenin's first decree on peace and to the latest Soviet peace initiatives -- such is he unswerving and responsible policy of the U.S.S.R. on the international scene. This is evidenced also by another extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

"In the history of mankind's struggle for peace, there is a special Afghan-Soviet chapter. Not so long ago one more illustrious page was inscribed in it -- the forthcming return home of six regiments from the limited contingent of Soviet soldiers-internationalists. This is our joint Afghan-Soviet contribution to the relaxation of international tensions. This historic step demonstrates that we have become stronger than before. Today, like never before, we are close to the ultimate victory over the enemy, to the establishment of a durable peace on Afghan soil, Najibullah emphasized. The present year is a special one for this planet. The United Nations has proclaimed it the year of peace. However, peace has enemies. The main ones among them are rabid militarism and U.S. imperialism. We have a special right to brand these war mongers. We, like no other people in the world, know the predatory face of imperialism and we accuse it", Najibullah said.

The next speaker at the rally was Abdul Wali Khan, chairman of the People's National Party of Pakistan. He emphasized the importance of the Soviet peace initiatives, noting that the Soviet Union was not only making proposals, but also taking practical steps. The return home of a part of the Soviet limited military contingent was of great importance, he said. It attested to the striving of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union for peace. All peaceful forces on this planet side with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, he said. The people taking part in the rally passed a resolution approving the Soviet peace proposals on the termination of nuclear testing and on the stage-by-stage effort to rid the earth of nuclear weapons till the year 2000, pointing out that they could lead to disarmament and safeguard peace and life on this planet.

BENAZIR BHUTTO, OPPOSITION LEADERS RELEASED

LD082311 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] London September 8 TASS -- Under the pressure of massive actions inside the country and protests of the world public, the Islamabad regime was forced to release today Benazir Bhutto, leader of the opposition Pakistan people's party, and a number of other leaders of the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy. Together with hundreds of activists of the movement, they were arrested last month for the participation in the biggest actions of the year held under the slogans of the resignation of Ziaul Haq and the holding of parliamentary elections. The REUTER news agency reports from Karachi that the decision to release the opposition leaders was taken a day before the date set by the Supreme Court of Sind Province for hearing the appeal of Benazir Bhutto demanding her immediate release.

GERASIMOV COUNTERS FRG'S WOERNER ON MORATORIUM

LD081123 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 7 Sep 86

[From the "International panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov: video interview with FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner by Vladimir Kondratyev at the FRG Defense Ministry in Bonn, date not given -- recorded in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Gerasimov] No I should like to enumerate some aguments against the Soviet moratorium, and for this I shall clear the floor for FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner. Vladimir Kondratyev interviewed him.

[Kondratyev] The FRG Defense Ministry is sited on the outskirts of Bonn. For almost 4 years at has been headed by Manfred Woerner, a well-known figure of the Christian Democratic Party and a Bundestag deputy. He is 51 years old. He completed his education as a lawyer, but he is also considered an experienced military specialist. For example, as an Air Force reservist he personally flies aircraft. This is Manfred Woerner's first interview for Soviet television.

Woerner, the Soviet Union has carried out no nuclear tests for more than 1 year. It recently extended again its unilateral moratorium until 1 January 1987. How do you assess this step by the Soviet leadership?

[Woerner] Our main aim -- I mean by this the FRG Government's -- consists of creating security with fewer weapons, that is, security for you, for the Soviet Union and the other East European countries, as well as for our country and the other countries of Western Europe. However, a moratorium is not disarmament. Discontinuance of nuclear tests is an important task of our policy, but in our opinion it must be linked on the one hand with substantial reductions of nuclear arms and on the other hand with broad possibilities of verification [kontrol]. The following principle has to operate: The fewer nuclear weapons there are, the less need for carrying out tests.

The moratorium is not an end in itself for the Soviet Union; it opens the way toward attaining a comprehensive accord in the sphere of arms limitation. The Federal Government is ready to follow such a way, if the conditions that I indicated are created.

[Kondratyev] are you aware of the danger that the continuance of nuclear tests will lead to the emergence of further improved kinds of arms, on the control [kontrol] of which it will not be possible to reach an accord in the future?

[Woerner] Yes, and in order to avoid this both world powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, must come to an agreement on radical reductions in existing stocks of nuclear arms. This is our aim. We want you and the Americans to have fewer weapons. For our part we are ready to contribute to this. The Federal Republic has voluntarily renounced the possession of and the right to dispose of nuclear arms. We would like the whole world to follow our example.

[Kondratyev] But why does the United States refuse to accept the soviet proposal for a moratorium on nuclear tests?

[Woerner] First and foremost, I want to stress that I represent the FRG. All I know is that the U.S. President says that he is very interested in an end to testing, one that is bilateral, coordinated, and mandatory, but in the context of a reduction of nuclear armaments. I feel it is absolutely necessary to realize that our world needs fewer weapons than it has at the present. This is the decisive factor. I repeat: The fewer weapons there are, the fewer tests there will be.

[Kondratyev] As the defense minister of a NATO country, how likely do you think it is that the Americans will stop their tests? And when do you think this will happen?

[Woerner] We place our hopes, first and foremost, on talks between the two world powers. The FRG federal chancellor and the Federal Government are extremely interested in seeing a second summit meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan. I expect that one of the subjects of such talks will be precisely this question.

[Kondratyev] But the Americans are still exploding nuclear devices in the Nevada desert.

[Woerner] In answer to that I would say, of course, that before the Soviet Union announced its moratorium -- that is , in the period since 1971 -- it in fact carried out more nuclear explosions than the Americans had. Of course, I am of the view that such reproaches of numerical comparisons do not help. I feel that what is really needed is the earliest possible agreement on disarmament.

[Kondratyev] Allow me to cite figures given by an unprejudiced source, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. It has calculated that since 1945 the United States has carried out a third more tests than the Soviet Union has.

[Woerner] I was quoting the figures of the last 15 years. But, I repeat,disputes about figures do not help us at all. The main task is to reduce the number of terrible weapons, while keeping in mind a balance of forces between the two sides. If this is achieved, there will be much more point in halting tests and it will be easier to reach agreement on this.

[Kondratyev] Thank you, Minister, for this interview.

[Gerasimov in studio] Let us now take a look at the minister's propaganda ammunition in order to determine its quality. Well, Woerner says that a moratorium does not amount to disarmament. That would be a good point if the moratorium had been described as an end in itself. But, as you know, the moratorium is not in itself the goal. It cannot take the place of a reduction in armaments. Who is saying that it does? With whom is Woerner arguing? Everyone is saying that by abstaining from carrying out explosions a start has been made. It is the beginning of the way to disarmament.

The minister goes on to say that he is willing to follow this way, but on one condition. But he himself makes it harder to follow this way by putting the cart before the horse and demanding a substantial reduction in armaments. We are not opposed to a substantial reduction. So, let us begin with a moratorium at least. That is easier to do.

What a good boy West German has been, the minister goes on to remark. it has not acquired its own nuclear weapons. Yes, but there has been a surplus of these weapons on its territory for a long time now. Even General Rogers, the commander of NATO forces in Europe, has called for these weapons to be dispersed a little among neighboring countries that are shunning these weapons. But West Germany does not shun them. It takes everything that it is given. So, it is not the good boy that the minister makes it out to be. This is not nuclear innocence.

The fewer weapons there are, the fewer tests there will be. This is the minister's favorite idea. He raised it in our interview not for the first time. He has spoken of it in other speeches. But is he not putting the cart before the horse again? Is it not right to say that the fewer tests there are, the fewer new weapons will be developed. Is it not better to do without them, without tests, altogether? Another weakness of the minister's aphorism is that its basic meaning can also be disputed. After all, one can easily imagine some U.S. general or other deciding that the fewer weapons there are, the more important it is to make sure that they are ready for action and therefore they must be checked more often. Besides, one can employ the opposite argument: The fewer tests there are, the fewer weapons there will be, because fewer new weapons will be developed. And the variety of such weapons will also be less.

Again the minister says he favors a reduction in nuclear weapons. In itself, a moratorium will not reduce these armaments, but it will prevent their being improved. In other words, it will reduce these armaments by comparison with what might happen if there is no moratorium. How does the minister answer this calculation, which is reached by the method he uses himself?

What about the number of tests? He claims that at one time we were carrying out more tests. Even if that were true, so what? Who was carrying out the most tests before that? For some reason the minister did not address that question. If you look at the distribution of explosions -- particularly underground explosions--over the years, you can easily see who is in the lead. As we know, the Americans are way ahead now, approximately 200 explosions ahead.

Well, as you saw, the minister subsequently adopted his reserve position. Figures are not very important, he said. In that case, what remains of the minister's arguments? It remains to welcome his willingness to reduce the number of weapons. That is good, but it would be better to eliminate them altogether. It remains to welcome his hopes and the hopes of his chancellor for Soviet-U.S. talks. The chancellor considers that the moratorium could be one of the subjects for these talks. Be that as it may, for some reason the United States has nor expressed willingness to join the moratorium under any circumstances whatsoever. It prevents the modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, you see. So, if you wanted to, you could see a contradiction here between the positions of Washington and Bonn.

MURAHKOVSKIY, FRG MINISTER DISCUSS ENVIRONMENT

LD081159 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1006 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep (TASS) -- Walter Wallman, FRG minister on matters of the environment, nature protection and the safety of nuclear reactors, was in Moscow between 7 and 8 September. His visit to the Soveit Union took place for the development of the accords that were reached in the course of the Soviet-German talks in Moscow last July.

Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the Commission for Environmental Protection and Rational Use of Natural Resources, received Walter Wallmann of the USSR Council of Minister Presidium.

The FRG minister also had conversations in the USSR State Committee for Hydrometerology and Environmental Control, the USSR State Committe for Utilization of Atomic Energy of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Questions of the cooperation between the two countries in the sphere of environmental protection and the safe development of nuclear energy were discussed.

An exchange of views was held on the special session of the general conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which will take place at the end of September in Vienna. The usefulness of the meetings held in Moscow was noted, and mutual willingness to deepen the mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in the spheres mentioned was expressed.

FRANK EXCHANGE HELD WITH BUNDESTAG DELEGATION

OW041001 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0035 GMT 4 Sep 86

[From the morning "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A USSR parliamentary delegation met a parliamentary group of the FRG Bundestag for relations with the Soviet Union led by its chairman, Schoefer, in the Kremlin on 3 September. Bilateral relations and some international issues were discussed during a frank exchange of views. Both sides spoke in favor of extending the East-West dialogue and continuing a search for ways to improve the political climate in Europe and the world. The urgent need for serious efforts to turn events away from confrontation and toward detente and cooperation was stressed at the meeting. Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Supreme Soviet deputies, and other officials took part in the discussion.

Delegation Ends Visit

LD052257 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS -- A delegation of the parliamentary group on relations with the USSR of the FRG's Bundestag led by its Chairman Helmut Schoefer had a talk today at the institute of world economy and international relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

There was an exchange of opinions on a broad range of economic and political problems of Western Europe as well as of questions on strengthening peace and security and the development of detente on the continent.

The delegation departed from the Soviet Union the same day. It stayed in the USSR at the invitation of a section of the USSR parliamentary group.

VORONTSEV IN PARIS ON M. EAST, DANILOFF, ARMS

PM081523 Paris LE MONDE in French 6 Sep 86 p 2

[Michel Tatu report: "Mr Vorontsov Expresses 'Sympathy' with Paris Following This 'Provocation'"]

[Text] Yuliy Vorontsov, former USSR ambassador to Paris, became first deputy foreign minister this spring and one of the protagonists of the "restructuring" of Soviet diplomacy started by Anatoliy Dobrynin, his former boss in Washington who is now Mr Gorbachev's main adviser. [paragraph continues]

This is what he came to demonstrate on a brief visit to Paris, during which he met with Mr Mitterrand at the Elysee, and with Mr Raimond and several of his aides at the Quai d'Orsay (he told us he did not have time to meet with Mr Chirac, who will, however, be welcomed in Moscow at the end of the year on a visit he has been invited to make). At a press conference held at his embassy on Thursday 4 September he combined the subtlety of the "new political thinking" with professionalism and was friendly, cautious, and inflexible according to the subjects raised.

He was friendly toward France following the attack on its soldiers in the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) the same day. As is known, Moscow recently adopted a more constructive attitude toward the UN force which was merely tolerated in the past and is now financed by a contribution from the USSR. Expressing his "sympathy" for France, Vorontsov supported France's appeal to the United Nations and called for an inquiry aimed at establishing the identity of those who perpetrated this "provocation." But Moscow is not going so far as to ask permission to send a contingent to UNIFIL in which he thinks neither the Americans nor the Soviets should participate.

Also with regard to the Near East, Vorontsov expressed optimism, stating that the preparatory committee to organize a peace conference between Israel and the Arab countries should be formed shortly. Presenting this idea as the "result of the meeting" between Mitterrand and Gorbachev in Moscow last June, the Soviet diplomat tried to draw France into his camp, and this probably explains his detour to Paris after a tour of several Arab capitals. Without contradicting him, the Quai d'Orsay is still very skeptical about the possibility of holding such a conference, which Moscow has been demanding for a very long time, but which presupposes that a series of problems with the United States and Israel are solved.

The Soviet-Israeli Meeting in Helsinki

However, Moscow's attitude toward Israel is still extremely inflexible. Presenting the soviet version of the meeting between officials of the two countries in Helsinki in August for the first time, Vorontsov said: "We requested that meeting to solve problems connected with our compatriots and our property in Israel. Our envoys requested visas for a group of Soviet officials but were given a lengthy expose on the fate of Soviet Jews. We know more about this situation than anybody and we do not need lessons on the subject. Because the visas were not granted, our officials took their leave and asked the Israeli side to forget about their request." After adding that everything said in Israel on the subject was "political theater," Mr Vorontsov stressed that this meeting had not and would not have any follow-up: "If the Israelis talk about nothing but Soviet Jews, we are not interested in meeting with them," he added.

He took a more moderate tone on Iran (the deputy minister described as "unjustified" the recent inspection of Soviet ships in the Gulf, but was anxious to specify that Moscow always reacts "calmly" and wants to go "as far down the road to normalization as Tehran wishes"), and on the Daniloff affair: Vorontsov thinks that "a solution must be found" and believes that one will be found "fairly quickly."

The diplomat was also anxious to stress the new state of mind which prevails in Moscow, particularly in two spheres. In the commercial sphere he recalled that the current reorganization of foreign trade will enable technical ministries and even Soviet enterprises to play a direct part in trade, and also that the creation of joint projects or joint ventures is now possible in the USSR.

In the disarmament sphere, he stressed what he sees as two concessions, namely the USSR's acceptance of on-the-spot monitoring, particularly during military maneuvers: First it will be possible to carry out such monitoring in the absence of disarmament measures, contrary to what Soviet diplomacy had always demanded; second, it will be able to cover the western part of the USSR, whereas the United States will not have to undergo such monitoring.

It is true that at the same time Marshal Akhromeyev, Red Army chief of general staff, made a statement to the TASS agency in which he gave details which considerably limit the scope of this monitoring. Land and air inspections will certainly be accepted, he said, but the latter will have to be carried out on board planes of the country inspected, piloted by its nationals. Foreign monitoring officials on board will merely "indicate to the pilot what course to take and where to bank to be able to observe the ground." He added that there is, therefore, no question of allowing overflight by foreign aircraft filled with instruments which could collect information about "any installation not subject to monitoring."

This is likely to complicate the latest negotiations at the Stockholm conference, which are due to be concluded at the end of this month. However, Mr Vorontsov was anxious to issue this warning now: Any failure "will not be our fault."

FURTHER ON SWISS FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT

More on Shevardnadze Talks

LD061215 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 6 Sep 86

[Text] Talks were held in Moscow on 5-6 September between Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Aubert, deputy chairman of the Federal Council, chief of the federal department of foreign affairs of the Swiss Confederation, who is in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

An exchange of views on topical aspects of the European and international situation was conducted in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere. It focussed on matters relating to the sphere of security, including prospects for putting into effect a reduction of nuclear armaments, and banning and elimination of chemical weapons and the reduction of the level of military confrontation in Europe and the world. Particular attention was paid to a discussion of the concept of a nuclear--free world that was put forward in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January this year, and the idea of creating a comprehensive system of international security that was formulated in the political report to the 27th CPSU Congress.

Comrade Shevardnadze stressed that the traditional policy of neutrality pursued by Switzerland was viewed by the Soviet side as a positive element in the maintenance of peace in Europe. The sides spoke out in favor of a search for ways of eliminating existing sources of tension in various regions of the world, which are fraught with the risk of dangerous complications for peace and international security.

The ministers voiced satisfaction with the state of bilateral relations and reaffirmed a willingness for their further comprehensive development.

They also advocated extending mutually-advantageous trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation and exchanges in the cultural sphere.

Aubert invited Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze to pay an official visit to the Swiss Confederation. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Shevardnadze Dinner Speech

PM081346 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Talks started 5 September in Moscow between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Pierre Aubert, deputy chairman of the Federal Council and chief of the Federal Department (minister) of Foreign Affairs of the Swiss Confederation. The same day the ministers signed an intergovernmental agreement on issues of taxation.

Eduard Shevardnadze gave a dinner in honor of Pierre Aubert. On the Soviet side, the dinner was attended by Nikolay Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR ministers, heads of a number of ministries and department; and other officials; on the Swiss side, by those accompanying Pierre Aubert.

In his speech, Eduard Shevardnadze said:

We are happy to pay the debt of hospitality to prominent representatives of the Swiss Confederation, a country which has been so cordial toward many of our fellow countrymen in the past and which today so willingly offers its capabilities for carrying out diplomatic contacts and meetings.

The founder of the Soviet state, V.I. Lenin, lived in your country for a number of years. We are grateful that the places connected with his activity in Switzerland are carefully preserved.

There is also a certain symbolic significance in the fact that the modern history of our relations began with an act carried out in mutual striving for peace: In November 1917, the Government of Soviet Russia asked the Swiss Government to render its good services in conveying to World War I participants proposals for concluding peace without annexations and indemnities.

In addition, naturally, fresh in all our minds is the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Mr Furgler, president of the Swiss Confederation, in Geneva in the autumn of last year during the Soviet-U.S. summit. The conversation between the leaders of our two countries has furthered the establishment of better mutual understanding and reflects in the most favorable way on the atmosphere of bilateral relations, giving them a new dynamism. Your arrival in Moscow, Mr Federal Councillor -- the first visit by a leader of a Swiss foreign policy department in the history of our relations -- continues the political dialogue and confirms the mutual urge to broaden contacts and ties in all spheres.

This year we marked the 40th anniversary of the reestablishment of diplomatic relations, and we have a solid period of regular and stable cooperation behind us. [paragraph continues]

We know each other well, and I think that neither you nor we have had any grounds for any serious disappointments. What is particularly valuable is that relations of trust have taken shape between our countries, and that a sense of confidence in each side's reliability as a conscientious partner has been strengthened. In other words, there is a good foundation in our relations and we have all that is necessary for them to become richer and multifaceted. We hope the ties will not only be mutually favorable and mutually useful but also serve the spiritual enrichment of both peoples. The exchange of opinions that is taking place between us today shows that the Swiss side shares such an approach, and this gives reason for firmly counting upon the development of constructive cooperation in many areas.

In the Soviet Union, they look with respect upon the choice of the status of permanent neutrality made by Switzerland and its role as a country of "good services" in the matter of arranging and keeping up a productive dialogue between East and West. The readiness of the Swiss Government to create the most favorable conditions for conducting negotiations on nuclear and space arms and on questions of ending nuclear weapons tests shows expressively enough where Switzerland's sympathies lie, and how it would like to see the international situation.

As far as we are concerned, our actions indicate best of all the thrust of Soviet policy and its objectives: We are persistently striving to achieve the realization of a program to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons, as set out in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January that year. The Soviet Union, by its actions, confirms its commitment to the idea of a nuclear-free world. Our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests has been in force for 13 months now, and it will remain in force until January 1 1987. This is an act of exceptional importance, undertaken in the interests of peace and the future of mankind.

All people, every state -- both nuclear or nonnuclear, large or small, neutral or a member of a military alliance -- is vitally interested in freeing the earth of nuclear weapons, as it is absolutely obvious that there are no borders for nuclear weapons, and that they are not selective. This is exactly why the problem of a moratorium on nuclear tests cannot lie beyond the national competence of any state, and nobody can be neutral about this.

We are also counting on a favorable perception by the Swiss side of the proposal to set up a comprehensive system of international security, and on constructive participation of your country in the development of specific aspects of such a system.

Switzerland invariably plays an active role in the development of all-European process, and in this area our countries cooperate closely and with benefit for this cause. This is currently particularly true with regard to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. We can sense the sincere desire of the Swiss side to promote in every way possible the successful completion of this forum.

Your activeness in Stockholm is very important asmuch as in the final stages of complex multilateral negotiations it is the neutral and nonaligned states that can have something particularly significant to say in the search for compromise options and solutions.

We note with satisfaction that on many questions the positions of our two countries are close and compatible, and that by and large we are working in the same direction.

We are confident of the fact that interaction between the Soviet Union and Switzerland will broaden and spread to an ever wider spectrum of international problems, becoming particularly close on issues of war and peace and strengthening universal security.

One would like to hope that your visit to the Soviet Union, Mr Federal Councillor, the frank exchange of opinions on a wide circle of international problems and issues of bilateral relations will open up new opportunities for parallel actions and cooperation. Our prospects are good. We can confidently direct ourselves toward a strengthening of the good and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Switzerland.

This cannot fail to bring joy. We sincerely want things to go well for you. [PRAVDA follows the report on Shevardnadze's speech with a report on Aubert's speech in reply and adds that "the dinner passed in a friendly atmosphere."]

Report on Aubert Dinner Speech

LD052043 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS -- "Neutrality is the main instrument of ensuring Switzerland's freedom, independence and sovereignty," said vice president of the Federal Council, head of the Federal Department of foreign affairs of the Swiss Confederation Pierre Aubert. He spoke here today at a dinner given in his honour by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

"We received with interest the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev that the Soviet Union will always be respecting this status," Pierre Aubert said. "Switzerland's policy of neutrality is the policy of stability and peace. A world conflict must not break out again," the guest said.

"The policy of active neutrality also presupposes the participation in international cooperation, in the quest for the solution of global problems. In this connection Switzerland exerts efforts aimed at promoting the improvement of political climate in Europe," Pierre Aubert said.

"Switzerland is cooperating with all countries participating in the European process, particularly with neutral and non-aligned European countries so as to find solutions acceptable to all. We have no wish and we cannot separate from each other the three 'baskets' of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Everything must be done to ensure a balanced advance. For the quests for stability and security will be futile unless the unhampered exchange of ideas, people and material values is guaranteed. Alongside this it is necessary to expand international cooperation in the spheres dealt with in the second 'basket,' be it atmospheric pollution or protection against radiation. It would be pleasant to note in this connection that the Soviet Union's and Switzerland's initiatives are mutually supplementing."

Kovalev Farewell at Airport

LD070912 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 7 TASS -- Pierre Aubert, deputy chairman of the Federal Council, head of the Federal Department (Minister) of Foreign Affairs of the Swiss Confederation, who paid an official visit to the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Government, left Moscow for home today.

At the airport he was seen off by Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and other officials.

DEMICHEV MEETS WITH FINNISH PRESIDENT KOIVISTO

LD081142 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0933 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Helsinki, 8 Sep (TASS) -- Today Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, received Petr Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, heading the USSR state delegation which has taken part in the funeral ceremony of Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, eminent Finnish state leader and former president.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the people of the Soviet Union, Petr Demichev conveyed to the president and to the people of Finland deep condolences in connection with the demise of Urho Kaleva Kekkonen.

In a friendly converstaion there was an exchange of opinions on a number of topical international problems and issues of Soviet-Finnish relations. The determination of both countries to maintain efforts aimed at the preservation of detente, elimination of the threat of war and at curbing the arms race was confirmed. P.N. Demichev drew M.Koivisto's attention to the practical steps of the Soviet Union in creating a comprehensive system of international security and to the 18 August 1986 statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on extending the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987.

Mutual satisfaction with the fruitful development of goodneighborly cooperation between the USSR and Finland, was expressed and the firm conviction that Soviet-Finnish relations will continue to develop in a stable and dynamic way on the basis of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was stated.

Taking part in the conversation were the members of the Soviet government delegation, Boris Chaplin, USSR Deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Vladimir Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland, and on the Finnish side, Taako Kalela,head of the president's chancellery.

Delegation Returns

LD081525 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1448 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow 8 Sep (TASS) -- The USSR Government delegation led by Petr Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which took part in the funeral ceremonies for the eminent Finnish leader of state, former President U.K. Kekkonen, returned today from Helsinki to Moscow.

The delegation was met in Moscow by Vladimir Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and other officials.

GORBACHEV WRITES PREFACE TO WORKS IN SWEDISH

LD051314 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Stockholm September 5 TASS -- The issue of a collection of selected speeches and articles by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev is an event of great socio-political significance in the life of Sweden.

At a ceremony held at the Soviet Embassy today the USSR's Ambassador to Sweden Borin Pankin briefed representatives of the Swedish public, political circles, mass media of the country with materials of the collection which was issued by the Goeteborg publishing house "Faam". Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the Swedish reader opens the collection: "Addressing the Swedish reader in connection with the issue of a collection of my works. I will cite a simple but very important fact: The Soviet Union and Sweden are close neighbours. And it is highly desirable that the proximity of our countries should not be only geographical".

Are there possibilities for that? Political practices provide a convincing answer to that question.

We shall not conceal that sometimes there was some roughness in Soviet-Swedish relations owing to misunderstandings or somebody's ill intention. But nevertheless, we are able to find a common language in substantial affairs.

Sweden, which abides by the traditional policy of neutrality, conducts a vigorous course aimed at improving the international political climate. And this is appreciated in our country. Olof Palme made an inestimable contribution to the moulding of that course. His tragic death was a better loss both to Sweden and the world community.

We treat with understanding the striving of Sweden and a number of ther states to establish a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe. The Soviet Union is ready to promote that and become the guarantor of such a zone. The putting of that idea into life and Sweden's proposals on establishing " nuclear-free corridor" in Central Europe would be important steps towards ridding our continent of nuclear weapon.

To maintain and consolidate peace has been and remains the top priority in the Soviet foreign policy. And this is exactly the aim of our initiatives. Our initiatives are directed at ending nuclear tests fully and everywhere, at eliminating nuclear armaments, destroying chemical weapons, carrying out a profound reduction in conventional armaments and, undoubtedly, keeping outer space peaceful.

The nuclear age calls for a new political thinking. No state can now ensure its security through military means alone. The way to security lies through political decisions. Security cannot be unilateral, to somebody's detriment, at somebody's expense. It can only be mutual, the security to all, What is at issue now is the survival of mankind and we have no other alternative but to learn to live together.

Our recent conversations with Prime Minister of Sweden Ingvar Carlsson in Moscow have shown that though we are not always, naturally, unanimous in appraising things, there are vast opportunities for cooperation between the USSR and Sweden in removing the threat of war. [sentence as received] We have agreed that any problems that might arise between our countries will be discussed straightforwardly and frankly, as good neighbors do, in the spirit of mutual understanding and with due account for the interests of both countries.

I am confident that there are vast, untapped possibilities for developing business relations between our countries. The opinion of the Soviet Union is that the economic relations should be free from transient political considerations. They should be based on a stable foundation, on taking mutual interests into account. We are ready for that. And it seems to me that provided Sweden's appropriate interest our mutual relations in this direction can develop dynamically. [sentence as received] It is exactly Sweden which has been one of the first Western countries to start trading with the young Soviet Russia, and that has not been forgotten in our country.

There are vast possibilities for broadening cooperation between our countries in culture. In the present day world it is very important that the nations should know and understand each other better. Therefore we stand for the exchange of cultural values, for contacts between people, we encourage tourism, sport links. We are open to other countries, to our neighbors, close and remote, since we know that truth is the best remedy against malicious cock-and-bull stories.

In conclusion, I express the hope that the acquaintance with the materials of the collection will help the Swedish readers to more precisely assess the aspirations and ideals of the Soviet people, our determination to advance, step-by-step, to more harmonious international relations. This is prompted by the requirements of the nuclear age, and the Soviet Union and Sweden can go together along this road.

I wish the Swedish people peace and well-being.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

The collection includes the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress, Mikhail Gorbachev's January 15 statement, speeches by the Soviet leader at meetings with the working people of the USSR, at meetings of party and state bodies, his pronouncements in the course of negotiations with prominent statesmen and politicians of different countries, at press conferences, interviews to Soviet and foreign mass media, other materials.

ARTICLE VIEWS U.S. 'DISPLEASURE' WITH LIBYA

PM090750 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Gennadiy Musayelyan: "Pirate 'Diplomacy.' Washington Has Elaborated a Detailed Plan for Aggression Against Libya"]

[Text] The outstanding Arab poet 'Abd al-Rahman al-Khamisi wrote a poem called "Pirates of the 20th Century."

Words of terror and deep bitterness! The poem's imagery conjures up before us a Lebanon bombarded by the guns of the battleship New Jersey and the Libyan cities of Tripoli and Benghazi after the missile and bomb raids by U.S. aircraft in March.

That armed provocation against a sovereign state highlighted once again the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism. Obviously Washington failed to achieve its aim. It encountered angry protests in the Arab world and mounting disaffection in the West European states and the United States itself.

But what do the bellicose U.S. crusaders, struggling into their armor of "neoglobalism," care about the opinion of the world community! The stormclouds are gathering once again on the Libyan horizon. A mighty armada is massing off the country's coast. The aircraft carriers Forrestal and America are already there. The aircraft carrier John Kennedy is hastening to support them. And dangerous preparations have begun south of Libya, in Chad. It has been reported in the press that the United States intends to send its "rapid deployment force" there if France supports the White House's anti-Libyan approach.

Washington intends to involve the NATO allies in the adventure it is setting up. To this end U.S. Permanent Representative at the United Nations Vernon Walters was sent to Western Europe. But even before the transatlantic emissary's trip, U.S. F-111 fighter-bombers had arrived in Britain.

Summing up what has been said, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL notes: Washington has elaborated a detailed new plan for aggression against Libya. Its aim is to overthrow the Libyan Government.

What has Libya "done wrong" this time? The totally unsubstantiated, tedious old arguments about Tripoli's involvement in international terrorism are cited. Evidently having decided to stun its readers, THE WASHINGTON POST published a U.S. State Department report. It names 32 countries in Central and South America where Libya is allegedly "arming guerrilla organizations or exerting some influence on ultraleftists and terrorists." In turn, NEWSWEEK magazine printed a report to the effect that "agents of M. al-Qadhdhafi" had transferred considerable funds to Muslim rebels in the Philippines and had organized explosions in Thailand and Indonesia. As for the immediate forecast, it is hinted that Libyan terrorists may soon carry out acts of sabotage in the FRG and Greece...

But the world is well aware of the real reasons for U.S. displeasure with Libya. It is its anti-imperialist course, its support for the Arab peoples' national liberation struggle and resolute criticism of U.S. policy in the Near and Middle East. It was in 1 September 1969, when the monarchy was overthrown and the biggest U.S. military base in Africa and the Near East -- Wheelus Field -- was removed, that the Pentagon and the CIA started elaborating "retaliatory strikes" against Libya.

I remember the long wall topped with pieces of broken glass. It surrounded the base of the U.S. airmen and sailors who used to pack the Italian traders' shops and trattorias in the center of Tripoli where the local Arabs felt ill at ease. Even television in Libya under King Idris only had an American channel: Movies ordered by the Pentagon were transmitted from the base. Of course, certain people on the other side of the Atlantic would like to bring back the old days...

But the Libyan people will not be intimidated. The Soviet Union and the progressive world public are with them today, as the country celebrates its national holiday -- Revolution Day. During the recent friendly working visit to Moscow by 'A. S. Jallud, member of the Libyan Revolutionary Leadership, the sides noted a number of concrete measures to further expand and deepen comprehensive contacts. A general agreement was signed between the USSR and Libya on economic, scientific, technical, and other types of cooperation for the period through 2000.

Hardening its anti-Libyan line, the U.S. Administration is pursuing several goals at once -- to establish supremacy in the region and gain control of the oil-producing countries' natural resources at all costs, and to complicate the international situation even more and thus establish "valid" reasons for the United States to further crank up the arms race. Finally, since the White House has no more arguments to justify its negative attitude toward the cessation of nuclear tests and other constructive Soviet proposals, its goal is to switch public attention to some other problem.

ETHIOPIAN PARTY DELEGATION VISITS MOSCOW 1-8 SEP

LD082227 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep (TASS) -- From 1 to 8 September a delegation of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia, headed by Mersie Ejigu, member of the WPE Central Committee and minister, was staying in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. It familiarized itself with the experience of the CPSU in the area of leadership of the national economy. The delegation had meetings and talks in the economic and international departments of the CPSU Central Committee, at the USSR Gosplan, ministries and departments; it also visited industrial enterprises in the capital.

The Ethiopian comrades noted the great significance of the innovatory decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress for countries that have chosen the path of progressive development. They highly assessed the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and its recent decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987.

FEDOROV COMMENTARY LAUDS SOWETAN RESISTANCE

MB050946 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 4 Sep 86

[Aleksandr Fedorov commentary: "South Africa Today"]

[Text] Thursday is the day of mourning in Soweto, the largest township of Johannesburg. It is in the memory of all those who suffered [word indistinct] outrages against participants in anti-apartheid actions. The black Africans are mourning the 30 killed and hundreds injured during actions in Soweto, the strongest of their kind in the last 2 years. More have been killed in South Africa since 12 June when the authorities decreed a state of emergency. There has been ample evidence that the authorities do not intend to stop.

On the day of mourning people in the townships and elsewhere in the country not only bemoaned their relatives and friends, they also expressed the determination of the oppressed to win justice. Characteristically they have ignored the ban imposed by the authorities on today's actions.

Ten years ago when Soweto had just lived through a bloodbath, the government was convinced that nobody there would ever dare to protest again. But the gunned-down ghetto did not put up. [Words indistinct] has been the example of Soweto, Crossroads, and dozens of other ghettos convinced that apartheid has no future. People are not born with saddles on their backs so that the [word indistinct] privileged few would govern them by law and God's blessing. These words belong not to communists, whom the South African authorities charge every now and them with incitement and export of revolution. Such a conclusion was drawn by one of the first American presidents, Thomas Jefferson, even though this statement by the ideologist of the then young American republic is regrettably forgotten by the Reagan administration helping Pretoria to save apartheid, and thereby causing new casualties both among the blacks and among the whites. If the South African authorities cannot be persuaded by evidence backed up by history lessons, they could be reminded of the recent past. Just 6 years ago there was the view in former Rhodesia that nothing in the world could break the foundations of white rule with the blacks being their servants. After that country proclaimed its independence its government has been successful in solving natural and race issues. Along with other nonaligned states, Zimbabwe has been doing all it can for justice to prevail in South Africa. Apartheid in South Africa seriously threatens not only the whole of Africa but the international security as well.

NICARAGUA'S BORGES URGES HEIGHTENED VIGILANCE

LD081257 Moscow TASS in English 0657 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Managua September 8 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Andrey Kurguzov.

Nicaraguan Interior Minister Tomas Borge Sunday accused the United States of scaling up aggression against this country.

Speaking at a rally devoted to the 8th anniversary of the Sandinist committees in defense of the revolution, he said counter-revolutionary mercenaries were being trained by U.S. military advisers at the Central Intelligence Agency's secret bases in Honduras and Puerto Rico.

Tomas Borge said the REagan administration, seeking to justify its criminal scheming against Nicaragua, had mounted a vicious smear campaign aiming to discredit the Sandinist popular revolution.

He flatly rejected what he called far-fetched charges that Nicaragua was involved in international drug trafficking.

It was common konwledge, the Nicaraguan interior minister said, that those involved in that dirty business included instead many high-ranking members of the U.S. Administration.

Tomas Borge urged the Nicaraguan people and army to heighten their vigilance in view of escalating intrigues by U.S. imperialists gambling on direct armed intervention in Nicaragua.

MOSCOW REPORTS ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT ON PINOCHET

LD080355 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] According to official reports from Chile, there has been an attempt to assassinate General Pinochet. The dictator's motorcade came under fire 50 km from the capital Santiago, not far from the general's country home. Seven bodyguards were killed, and the dictator himself was slightly injured in the hand. A state of siege has been declared throughout the country. The Manuel Rodriguez Patriotic Front has claimed responsibility for the action. The attempt comes only days before the 13th anniversary of the military coup on Thursday which brought Pinochet to power.

SOVIET SEAMEN INJURED IN EXPLOSION IN PERU

PM051504 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "What Happened in Callao?"]

[Text] Information received from Callao still does not allow the picture of what happened to be fully reconstructed. Nevertheless, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry has managed to put together the following:

Six Soviet citizens were injured as a result of an explosion in the trade center in Callao. G. Georgadze, R. Bechekhiya, M. Garuchava, and M. Popkhadze, crew members of the factory ship Bazaleti of the Poti deep-sea fishing administration, received moderately severe injuries. They are expected to recover within the week.

The Bazaleti's second engineer, V. Gudzhabidze, is in very serious condition. All casualties were given prompt first aid and are in constant contact with staffers at the Soviet Embassy in Peru. Appropriate treatment has been arranged for them. V. Kornoushenko, crew member of the factory ship Ioseliani, which belongs to the same administration, received moderately severe injuries but refused hospitalization and went home to Poti. These trawlers are among the Soviet fishing vessels which, under an agreement between the USSR and Peru, are operating in adjacent areas of the Pacific.

According to reports from Lima, the Peruvian police are investigating the terrorist act in which Soviet seamen were injured. Peruvian newspapers are expressing the view that the explosive device was equipped with a timing mechanism or operated by remote control.

The Peruvian mass media also note that the seamen's lives were saved because the bomb was hidden under a counter which reduced the force of the explosion.

According to General Jorge Flores Torres, Peruvian minister of war, "the attempt on the seamens' lives should be resolutely condemned because its aim is to complicate Soviet-Peruvian relations."

A similar comment was made in an interview in the newspaper NACIONAL by Jorge del Prado, secretary general of the Peruvian Communist Party Central Committee. In his opinion the terrorist action against the Soviet seamen was most probably committed by a rightwing paramilitary grouping.

The crime was resolutely condemned by Benjamin Mandueno, congressional deputy from Peru's ruling American Popular Revolutionary Alliance Party. He demanded a thorough investigation of the crime and the punishment of those responsible.

DOLGIKH ATTENDS MEETING FOR OIL, GAS WORKERS

LD060913 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] The oil and gas extraction industry is a basic branch of our economy, which to a considerable degree determines the achievements of the entire national economy. On the eve of their professional day the oil workers have achieved the daily level of output of precious raw materials scheduled in the year's plan. They are confidently building up the pace of production in order to eliminate their debt to the national economy after lagging behind for many years.

At a festive meeting today, which was devoted to Oil and Gas Industry Workers' Day, there was talk of ways to restructure the industry and to overcome its shortcomings. The meeting's presidium included Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; the heads of a number of ministries and departments; production front-rankers; socialist competition winners and representatives of the capital's public. A report was delivered by Comrade Dinkov, minister of the petroleum industry.

Those taking part in the meeting gave the assurance that the oil workers, gas workers and builders of the fuel trunk pipelines will devote all their energy, experience and know-how to achieving a successful fulfillment of the 5-year plan tasks and to making a weighty contribution to strengthening the fuel and energy potential of the country.

CULTURAL FOUNDATION COMMITTEE MEETING REPORTED

PM031414 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Spiritual Riches for the People"]

[Text] A session of the Soviet Cultural Foundation organizing committee was held in Moscow 29 August under the chairmanship of P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The foundation's draft statutes and organizational and creative questions associated with the holding of a constituent conference were examined. Reports were delivered by V. G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture; and B.S. Ugarov, president of the USSR Academy of Arts.

It was noted at the session that the formation of the foundation will create important prerequisites for further developing the people's socialist self-management, directly involving various sections of the population in cultural building, and utilizing their material and creative efforts in the interests of further developing artistic culture.

The foundation must give material, moral, and legal support to social initiatives aimed at further developing vocational and amateur creativity and promote the implementation of artistic ventures and projects. It must attract voluntary contributions from Soviet and foreign citizens, social organizations, and creative unions both in monetary terms and in terms of works of literature, art, folk creativity, historic relics, published works, and manuscripts.

The need for the foundation to actively participate in work to develop international cultural ties and exchanges and to seek out and return home jewels of the country's culture which are of nationwide importance was also stressed.

The organizing committee discussed and basically approved the draft statutes. It was deemed expedient to publish them in the press for extensive discussion by the public. Writers Yu. V. Bondarev, B.I. Oleynik, and V.B. Karpov; Academicians D.S. Likhachev, and B.Y. Rybakov; sculptor M.K. anikushin; F.M. Baganov, chief of the USSR Council of Ministers Main Archives Administration; and others took part in the debates.

A decision was also adopted to hold the constituent conference of the Soviet Cultural Foundation in Moscow in November. The conference will examine the organization's tasks and the main avenues of its activity, ratify its composition, and elect leading organs. The delegates to the conference will be nominated at general meetings or meetings of the aktiv at labor collectives, creative and social organizations, scientific institutes and union republic scientific establishments, and at the collectives of the foundation's constituent organizations.

Yu. P. Voronov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Culture Section, took part in the session.

FURTHER COVERAGE ON AFTERMATH OF LINER ACCIDENT

Leadership Condolences

PM081338 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Sep 86 First Edition p 1

[Message "From the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] In connection with the tragic loss of life in the accident involving the passenger steamer Admiral Nakhimov the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers express profound condolences to the families, relatives, and friends of those who died.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers

Report on Relief Work

LD082239 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Sep 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; V. Obraztov video report]

[Text] In Novorossiysk work continues on eliminating the consequences of the accident of the passenger ship Admiral Nakhimov. In this second week, the town on the shores of Tsemeskaya Bykhta Bay lives and works in a single upsurge to eliminate as quickly as possible the consequences of the accident and to do everything possible for the rescued passengers and crew members of the ship, Admiral Nakhimov, to lighten the weight of grief of relatives of those who died. Here, in the building of the gorkom, the government commission is at work, headed by Geydar Aliyevich Aliyev. The commission workd virtually around the clock. In its everyday intensive program, aside from the solution of up-to-the-minute matters, there are meetings with relatives of those who died, with inhabitants of Novorossiysk every day. This meeting was held yesterday in the streets of the town.

[Begin recording] We are very grateful to the inhabitants of the town of Novorossiysk for their active response in every way. First, rescue work was well organized and the leadership of the town, party, and soviet, the maritime leadership here and servicemen, they responded very quickly. At night, in heavy seas, a considerable number of people were rescued. This was the result of large-scale rescue work.

All these days, the relatives of those who died have been surrounded by the concern and attention of the town inhabitants; this is a result of the large-scale work being done by party, soviet, and administrative workers. Many are working around the clock; there have been many such enterprisig, patriotic proposals. We are even getting telegrams from other towns. Here, I have; must been given a telegram from Caspian sea divers; these are sea oil workers. Seven people have signed their names: We are ready to come immediately to fulfill any diving work whatever. But there is no need for this. Some are already transferring money here by telegraph. But, we have already mentioned that there is no need for this. I thank you for your active response, for your patriotic initiative, for your active civic and political response. I wish you all good health and success in your work. Good-bye, comrades. [end recording]

GEOPHYSICIST ON AERIAL SURVEY OF CHERNOBYL AREA

PM090816 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Doctor of Technical Sciences E. Ya. Ostrovskiy by correspondent G. Alimov: "What a Bird's Eye View Revealed: A Special Examination of the Territory Adjacent to the Chernobyl AES Has Been Carried Out" -- date and place not specified]

[Text] Specialists of the USSR Ministry of Geology's "Aerogeologiya" Association, the I.V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, and the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute have carried out a joint comprehensive examination of 12,000 square km of land around the [Chernobyl AES. The first stage of this work is complete. Our correspondent met with Dr Technical Sciences E. Ya. Ostrovskiy, USSR State Prize winner and chief geophysicist of the "Aerogeologya" Association's Moscow experimental-methodological space- and aerogeological expedition.

[Alimov] Emil Yakovlevich, why precisely was your organization brought into this work?

[Ostrovskiy] We possess the most modern aerial gamma spectrogram equipment. Normally it is used to search for mineral deposits -- gold, oil, or diamonds... Our task was to photograph the territory 10 km from the AES. The aim was to provide a complete up to the minute picture. Specialists from various fields had studied the situation before us. Of course, they used different methods and scales for assessing the phenomenon. We have now tried to take a single look at the situation and break the results down according to the different elements which were thrown into the atmosphere after the explosion and may have settled on the ground.

[Alimov] How was the investigation conducted?

[Ostrovskiy] The data was collected both from the air and on the ground. Our helicopter flight paths were coordinated with the meteorological situation which developed since April 27, that is, immediately after the accident. Thus, areas were highlighted where, in theory, "contaminated" precipitation could have fallen. [Paragraph continues]

Those areas brought to light during the aerial photography process were noted down. Then staffers of the Institute of Atomic Energy followed our tracks with radiation monitoring equipment on board a helicopter. They determined the centers of anomalous deposits initially from the air, then land, and took samples in such a way as not to disturb the structure of the soil. Furthermore, highly accurate spectral analyses have been conducted using semiconductor equipment to determine distribution and concentration of various radionuclides... In brief, we established their relative distribution, they determined the concentration.

[Alimov] Can you give us the precise area of this work?

[Ostrovskiy] A 110-km square centered on Pripyat. We flew from Chernigov. The instruments were set up over the Kiev reservoir. The water in it, by the way, is exceptionally pure. Then we set course "for the zone." We flew from south to north and back at an altitude of 170 meters and a speed of 150 km an hour.

[Alimov] How long did the investigation take in all?

[Ostrovskiy] It began on 5 July and on 20 August the results were passed to the Government Commission.

[Alimov] And what conclusions have you reached?

[Ostrovskiy] It has been established that the radiation situation in the investigation area has improved. The radionuclide distribution area was quite accurately determined and quantitatively evaluated.

The results of our work make it possible to determine more effectively the decontamination measures, measures to return evacuees to their homes, and agrotechnical measures to be taken. The work has been highly rated by the commission.

[Alimov] Will the investigation go on?

[Ostrovskiy] Yes. In September approximately 10,000 square km more will be photographed from the air.

BRIEFS

ORDER OF OCTOBER -- The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has awarded the Order of the October Revolution to Vladimir Andreyevich Zakharov, first secretary of Kalmyk Oblast committee of the CPSU, in recognition of his services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state and his 50th birthday. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 8 Sep 86 LD]